Daily Report

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-88-117
Friday
17 June 1988

Daily Report
Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-88-117 *17 June 1988*

CONTENTS

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

Non-Proliferation Talks Seen as 'Constructive' 1
U.S. General Cited on Verification Procedure *[PRAVDA 16 Jun]* 1
Nuclear Expert on Experiment at Test Sites 2
Zholkver on Polish Arms Limitation Proposals 2

COMMUNIST RELATIONS

Bloc, PRC Leaders Briefed on Moscow Summit *[PRAVDA 8 Jun]* 4

WORLDWIDE ISSUES

Work of UN Session on Disarmament Reviewed 5
Session Chairman Cited 5
Proposal on Naval Arms 5
Control Agency Proposed 5
NATO 'Caught Unawares' 6
Petrovskiy on Proposals 6
Gerasimov, Shishlin in Foreign Policy Roundtable *[Prague Television]* 7
Delegate Addresses ILO Session on Human Rights *[TRUD 8 Jun]* 12
Silayev Attends European Standards Meeting *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 14 Jun]* 13
More on Demichev Talk With International Lawyers *[PRAVDA 14 Jun]* 13
France, Iran Restore Diplomatic Relations *[PRAVDA 16 Jun]* 14

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

United States & Canada

Rogov Eyes Changes in Relations With U.S. *[PRAVDA 14 Jun]* 15
U.S. Looking for 'Loopholes' in Afghan Accords *[Vavilov]* 17
Reagan Seeks Renewed Military Aid for Contras 17
Kornilov on VOA's 'Vicious Allegations' 18
Reagan Remarks on Baltic Republics Deplored 18
Supreme Soviet-U.S. Congress Telebridge Noted 19
Delegation in U.S. for Joint Peace March 20

China

Final Part of Titarenko Remarks on Reform 21
More on Liaoning Delegation's Visit to USSR 22
Received by Maslennikov *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 8 Jun]* 22
Cooperation Document Signed *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 9 Jun]* 22
Visit Khabarovsk *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 14 Jun]* 22
'Satisfied' With Visit 23

Near East & South Asia

Rebel Activities in Afghan Provinces Reported 23
Troops Reportedly Deployed Near Pakistan Border *[Beijing]* 24
Afghan Government Wins Vote of Confidence 24
Soviet Red Cross Appeal on POW's in Pakistan 24
Officials Meet New York Group 24
Zaykov Receives Kabul PDPA Officials 16 Jun 24

Pakistan Leader Enacts Shari'a as Supreme Law 25
Dobrynin Receives Algieria's Defense Official 25
Petrovskiy Meets With Egypt's 'Abd al-Majid 25
Sytenko Briefs Iraqi President on Summit 25
Polyakov Briefs Libya's Jallud on Summit 25
Libya-Chad Reconciliation Moves Reported *[Filatov in PRAVDA 14 Jun]* 26

East Europe

Gorbachev To Visit Poland 10-20 Jul 26
Pyadyshev Interviewed on Relations With Bulgaria *[Sofia TRUD 15 May]* 26
PRAVDA Reports Antonov Activities in Prague *[16 Jun]* 27

West Europe

Gromyko Meets With Finnish Ambassador 15 Jun *[PRAVDA 16 Jun]* 28
TASS Cites French Expert on Election Results 29
French Communist Comments *[PRAVDA 16 Jun]* 29
Commentator Views Italian Premier's U.S. Visit *[Gerasichev]* 29
FRG Minister Urges Easing Cocom Restrictions *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 9 Jun]* 30
Two Economic Contracts Signed With Turkey *[IZVESTIYA 11 Jun]* 30
Supreme Soviet Greets British Queen on Birthday *[IZVESTIYA 11 Jun]* 30

Latin America & Caribbean

Dobrynin at Meeting in Memory of Che Guevara *[PRAVDA 15 Jun]* 30
Nicaraguan Contras Seek Further U.S. Aid *[Serikov]* 31

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Political & Social

Tretyakov Replaced as Sakhalin Party Leader 32
Sverdlovsk First Secretary Petrov Replaced 32
Gorkiy Obkom First Secretary Replaced 32
Further Reportage on Armenia, Azerbaijan Events 32
Vezirov Addresses Intelligentsia *[LITERATURNAYA GAZETA 15 Jun]* 32
Republics' Rayons' Joint Work *[Baku]* 32
Vezirov Meets Muslim Leader *[Baku]* 32
Muslim Leader Cited 33
Armenian Parliament Session *[Yerevan]* 33
Azerbaijan Rejects Transfer *[AFP]* 34
TASS Reports Rejection 34
Arutyunyan 1 Jun Yerevan Address Described *[Yerevan KOMMUNIST 2 Jun]* 34
Armenian Supreme Soviet Session Viewed *[IZVESTIYA 17 Jun]* 34
Opinion Needs 'Shaping' in Transcaucasus *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 16 Jun]* 36
Lithuania 'Rehabilitating' Stalin 'Victims' 37
Kazakh Central Committee Plenum Reported
[Alma-Ata KAZAKHSTANSKAYA PRAVDA 5 Jun] 37
Slow Progress Seen in Ukraine Restructuring *[Kiev PRAVDA UKRAINY 11 Jun]* 38
Zaykov Meets with Moscow Architects *[PRAVDA 16 Jun]* 39
Zaykov Addresses Auto Plant's Aktiv *[PRAVDA 11 Jun]* 40
Religious Celebrations Continue in Ukraine 42
Demichev Receives Chief of U.S. Interfaith Body *[PRAVDA 14 Jun]* 43
Dobrynin Receives Evangelist Billy Graham *[PRAVDA 14 Jun]* 43
News Conference Held on Millennium Celebrations 43
'No Prisoners of Conscience' 44
Church Festivities End in Leningrad 44
NASH SOVREMENNIK Attacks Shmelev *[AFP]* 44
Burlatskiy on Objectives of CPSU Conference 45
Moscow Delegates to Party Conference Viewed *[Prokhorov]* 45

Readers View Delegate Election Procedure *[IZVESTIYA 11 Jun]* 46
Italian Paper on Yaroslavl Demonstration *[Milan L'UNITA 12 Jun]* 48
Ways To Enhance Supreme Soviet Role Suggested *[PRAVDA 13 Jun]* 49
Election of Central Committee Members Urged *[MOSCOW NEWS No 20]* 52
Moscow TV Views Upcoming Party Conference Tasks 53
Paper Views Battle Against Bureaucracy *[PRAVDA 9 Jun]* 55
Social Impact of Brezhnev Era Pondered *[Bestuzhev-Lada in NEDELYA No 23]* 57
NOVYY MIR Editor on Impact of Glasnost *[Rome LA REPUBBLICA 11 Jun]* 61
'Bukharin Club' Activities Reported *[SOVETSKAYA KULTURA 7 Jun]* 62
Cinema Union Officials on State of Art 66

Economic

PRAVDA Account of Decision on Combine Work *[10 Jun]* 67
Slyunkov at Estonian Cost Accounting Meeting 68
Light Industry Workers Day Observed 69

Agricultural

Nikonov Visit to Chelyabinsk Aktiv Reported 69
Addresses Members 69
Tours Pedigree Farm 69
Completes Tour 70
Leaders Sign Obituary of Agricultural Scientist *[IZVESTIYA 8 Jun]* 70

Scientific

Marchuk Advocates Science Academy Elections 70
Sagdeyev, Primakov on French Space Cooperation 71
Cosmonauts Undock From 'Mir', Return to Earth 71
'Zora' Microprocessor Cited 71
'Soyuz' Prepares for Return 72
Biotechnological Studies Noted 72
'Soyuz' Undocking Reported 72
Landing Reported 72
Mission Summarized 73

Non-Proliferation Talks Seen as 'Constructive'

LD1506143188 Moscow TASS in English 1412 GMT 15 Jun 88

[Text] Vienna June 15 TASS—A new round of Soviet-American consultations on problems pertaining to non-proliferation of nuclear weapons has closed here.

In the light of the results of the Moscow meeting between Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and U.S. President Ronald Reagan, it was stressed at the consultations that the conclusion of the Soviet-American Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles, the progress made on the way towards other agreements in the field of limitation and reduction of nuclear weapons is a real contribution by the USSR and the USA to consolidating the Treaty on Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons.

In connection with the 20th anniversary of the signing of the non-proliferation treaty this year, the great significance was stressed of that treaty, which is the broadest as regards the composition of the parties to an agreement in the field of the limitation of weapons for ensuring international peace and security.

In the course of the consultations the sides discussed questions involved in preparations for the fourth conference to examine the effect of the treaty due to be held in 1990 and agreed on specific steps which they will take as its depositaries to ensure a successful holding of the conference.

A broad range of problems was discussed in connection with the consolidation of the treaty and the non-proliferation regime, which formed on its basis, the regional aspects of non-proliferation, questions pertaining to the activities of the international atomic energy agency in the further development of international cooperation for the peaceful uses of nuclear energy.

The consultations proceeded in a businesslike constructive atmosphere reflecting the level of interaction between the two countries on questions pertaining to eliminating the threat of nuclear war and ensuring universal security, which has grown as a resuh of the active Soviet-American dialogue.

The Soviet delegation at the consultations was led by Boris Semenov, chairman of the USSR State Committee for the uses of nuclear energy, the American—by Ambassador at Large Richard Kennedy. Taking part in the consultations were senior officials of a number of ministries and departments of both countries and their missions at international organizations in Vienna.

U.S. General Cited on Verification Procedure

PM1706094188 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 16 Jun 88 Second Edition p 5

[Report by own correspondent V. Gan: "Everything Is Ready"]

[Excerpts] Huntsville (Alabama)-Washington—Very soon U.S. military transport aircraft will begin to land in Moscow. As General R. Lajoie says, the "serious partners in security" will gather on Soviet land armed with cameras, scales, and radioactivity detectors. An absolutely new, as yet unknown, chapter will begin in our bilateral relations with their arrival. For both sides, the post of inspector verifying the observance of the agreed measures for destroying nuclear missiles belonged only quite recently to the realm of the fantastic. Today it is a reality. [passage omitted]

A most tremendous amount of work lies ahead—after all, hundreds of Soviet and U.S. missiles are to be eliminated. In addition, it is understandable that the decades of mutual suspicion, distrust, and overt hostility in no way make this work easier. It will probably be impossible to avoid misunderstandings, disruptions, and failures as in any new, unusual matter when both sides are learning the rudiments of cooperation.

I spoke about all this with Gen R. Lajoie, chief of the On-Site Inspection Administration recently created under the Pentagon. He has great experience of contacts with our country. The general has a fine command of Russian—he worked for 3 years at the U.S. attache office in Moscow.

Lajoie does not consider himself "an idealist or naive person." A new historical stage has arrived in our relations, he said. But, he added, we should not succumb to euphoria over mutual trust. Trust should unfailingly be based on verification, and only this combination can be deemed the most realistic approach toward arms control. He does not believe in the possibility of the complete destruction of arms. "Although I have a positive attitude toward arms control, as a military man, I will say that disarmament is unrealistic. There will always be a need for deterrent forces. The present treaty is a positive step in the right direction. But we should not deceive ourselves that we can destroy all weapons," Lajoie said. Well, each person has the right to his viewpoint.

The four Soviet journalists who came to Redstone arsenal were "the first Russians" for the local commanders—Colonels N. Hurst and T. Brown. Hospitable hosts, they shared without guile their hopes for the success of joint steps to implement the treaty. "I await the Soviet inspectors with interest. I am a professional and am interested in fulfilling everything which accords with U.S. national security interests," N. Hurst said.

...The Pentagon C-141 Star Lifter transport aircraft took us from Washington to Huntsville in 90 minutes. The path which our countries have traveled to make all this possible has been far longer. It is reported that this path will have its own memorial—missiles which have been made harmless put on public display—as a memorial of common sense, as a symbol of what people can do for their salvation.

Nuclear Expert on Experiment at Test Sites

LD1706090388 Moscow TASS in English 0800 GMT 17 Jun 88

[Text] Moscow June 17 TASS—The preparation of a joint Soviet-American experiment to monitor nuclear explosions and the presence of Soviet and American specialists at the test ranges of the two countries are a good experience of openness and cooperation, Viktor Mikhaylov, director of the Soviet expert group leaving Sunday, June 19, by air for Nevada nuclear test range, said today.

The conduct of a joint monitoring experiment which will begin in several days' time, he said in an interview with a TASS diplomatic correspondent, is an integral part of full-scale Soviet-U.S. talks on the nuclear testing programme. Agreement to hold such talks was reached in September last year.

As the first step at the talks, the Soviet Union and the United States should coordinate improved measures to monitor compliance with the so-called threshold treaties—the 1974 Treaty on the Limitation of Underground Tests of Nuclear Weapons and the 1976 Treaty on Underground Nuclear Explosions for Peaceful Purposes. The mandate for the talks also envisages that the sides will coordinate further intermediate limits on nuclear tests on the way to the ultimate goal: to terminate them completely.

The Soviet expert recalled that the above-mentioned treaties which have a permitted nuclear explosion yield threshold of 150 kilotons never entered into force because the U.S. Administration regarded the verification measures contained in it as insufficient.

The purpose of the experiment is to establish what improved verification methods are advisable to use for control over the 1974 treaty. "We regard the teleseismic method which does not require the presence of measuring personnel at the test range, as quite effective and sufficient. The United States, for its part, insists on the so-called hydrodynamic method which is based on making measurements directly at the test range. The joint experiment will make it possible to direct the discussion of this problem from the theoretical field into a practical one," Viktor Mikhaylov said.

An important advantage of teleseismic measurements, unlike hydrodynamic ones, is that by means of them it is possible to register explosions of very small yield from a distance of several hundred kilometres.

Two explosions will be carried out within the framework of the experiment: one at the Nevada test range in the middle of August, and the other one at the Semipalatinsk test site in the middle of September. Their yield should near 150 kilotons and in any case should not be less than 100 kilotons. Both sides on the basis of complete reciprocity will get an opportunity to gauge the yield of the explosions by using both the teleseismic and hydrodynamic methods.

Zholkver on Polish Arms Limitation Proposals

LD1606220788 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1800 GMT 16 Jun 88

[Text] The Polish Government has sent to all participant countries in the CSCE a statement setting out proposals on reducing armaments and strengthening trust in central Europe. Here is the latest news commentary by our political observer, Aleksandr Zholkver:

[Zholkver] The present initiative is a further development of what is known as the Jaruzelski Plan, which was proposed by the Polish leader last year. In the time since then, the Polish Government has conducted a whole range of bilateral and multilateral consultations with representatives of other states, which has made it possible to make the approaches to the disarmament problem in central Europe more precise and specific.

Moreover, positive progress has clearly emerged in this process recently. I am referring here primarily to the implementation of the Soviet-U.S. Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles. Now the Polish Government is proposing further measures in the sphere of disarmament. They concern mainly the reduction of tactical nuclear weapons of which, as is known, there are also large stockpiles in Europe. I would note in particular that these are weapons intended for offensive operations, for no one would use nuclear weapons for defensive purposes on their own territory. On the basis of all of this, the Polish Government advocates holding separate talks on reducing tactical nuclear weapons, especially in such a heavily populated region as central Europe, a place, moreover, where the line of contact between the two major military groupings lies.

I would note in this connection that other countries of this region, too, are issuing specific initiatives on disarmament and strengthening security in central Europe. The GDR and Czechoslovakia propose creating here a

300-km nuclear-free corridor and a zone free from chemical weapons. This proposal has received the support of the Social Democratic Party of the FRG. In their turn, Bulgaria and Romania have advocated turning the Balkan peninsula into a nuclear-free zone, which has met with a favorable response in Greece.

Next week a broad international meeting is to be held in Berlin specially devoted to the problem of creating nuclear-free zones in various regions of the world. And so I think that one can state with satisfaction that despite all the difficulties the process of curbing the arms race is gathering pace.

Bloc, PRC Leaders Briefed on Moscow Summit

PM1306110188 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 8 Jun 88 Second Edition p 6

[TASS report: "Victory for Realism and Reason. CPSU Central Committee General Secretary's Special Representatives Brief Foreign Statesmen"]

[Text] Special representatives of the CPSU Central Committee general secretary have visited a number of foreign countries. In the course of the conversations held with party and state leaders and politicians, they briefed them on the meeting between M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and R. Reagan in Moscow and familiarized them with the Soviet leadership's assessment of the results and the significance of this major event, which has demonstrated a new phase in the political dialogue between the USSR and U.S. supreme leadership.

E. Honecker, general secretary of the SED Central Committee and chairman of the GDR Council of State, had a meeting with V.V. Zagladin, member of the CPSU Central Committee and first deputy chief of the CPSU Central Committee International Department. The GDR leader expressed profound gratitude for the briefing and stressed that the meeting between M.S. Gorbachev and R. Reagan in the Soviet capital was an important landmark in the efforts to strengthen peace and positive trends in the development of East-West relations. E. Honecker pointed out that the GDR approves and fully supports the results of the Moscow meeting, which made an important contribution to the continuation of political dialogue, reason, and realism.

W. Jaruzelski, first secretary of the PZPR Central Committee and chairman of the Polish Council of State, received V.P. Loginov, first deputy chief of a CPSU Central Committee department. W. Jaruzelski thanked him for the briefing, stressing that the meeting between M.S. Gorbachev and R. Reagan will lend powerful impetus to positive trends in international relations. The entire Polish people, he stressed, followed the Moscow meeting very attentively and the sympathies of practically all strata of Polish society are on the side of the forces of peace and reason and the Soviet Union's policy.

R.P. Fedorov, deputy chief of a CPSU Central Committee department, was received by T. Zhivkov, general secretary of the BCP Central Committee and chairman of the Bulgarian State Council. The Bulgarian leader noted with profound satisfaction that the success of the Moscow talks serves the interests of all states and fits in with the aspirations of all mankind. The BCP and the Bulgarian people followed attentively and were completely involved in the course of the Moscow meeting; they approve and fully support its results, and see them as a great contribution to the victory of the ideas of reason and realism, without which the complex problems of the day cannot be resolved. It was pointed out at the meeting that restructuring and the advance of the ideas of the new political thinking in the international arena are interdependent processes, which make it possible to pose in earnest and to consistently resolve the tasks of creating a nuclear-free and nonviolent world.

K. Grosz, general secretary of the MSZMP Central Committee and chairman of the Hungarian Council of Ministers, received A.I. Vlasov, first deputy chief of the CPSU Central Committee Propaganda Department. The Hungarian leader gave a high assessment of the results of the Soviet-U.S. Moscow summit. K. Grosz stressed that the MSZMP wholly concurs with and fully supports the CPSU's political course, which once again showed itself so convincingly at the meeting in question.

V.M. Nikoforov, USSR deputy foreign minister, visited M. Jakes, general secretary of the CPCZ Central Committee. The Czechoslovak side gave a high assessment of the results of the meeting in Moscow and of M.S. Gorbachev's principled approach, which has met with complete understanding and support among the Czechoslovak people. Czechoslovakia's working people followed with great interest everything that took place during that time in Moscow. The significance of the visit goes far beyond Soviet-U.S. relations. The results of the talks constitute a common success for us and the victory of realism and reason.

Romanian President N. Ceausescu, general secretary of the RCP, received I.P. Aboimov, USSR deputy foreign minister. The Romanian leader received the briefing with satisfaction and stressed the importance of the persistent efforts aimed at the speediest conclusion of a treaty on a 50-percent reduction in strategic offensive arms, stressed the importance of developing Soviet-U.S. relations, and noted that there is no other path than that of talks in relations between states.

J. Batmonh, general secretary of the MPRP Central Committee and chairman of the Presidium of the Mongolian People's Great Hural, received M.N. Smirnovskiy, deputy chief of a CPSU Central Committee department. J. Batmonh expressed cordial gratitude to the Soviet leadership for the briefing. Assessing highly the international significance of the Soviet-U.S. summit, he stressed that M.S. Gorbachev's tremendous efforts played an important role in its successful outcome. J. Batmonh pointed out that the meeting's examination of regional conflicts is of fundamental importance for the elimination of seats of tension in Asia, Africa, and Latin America.

I.A. Rogachev, USSR deputy foreign minister, met with Tian Zhengpei, PRC deputy foreign minister. The Chinese side stated that the PRC welcomes the results of the talks between USSR and U.S. leaders in Mosocw. It expressed the hope that the remaining obstacles in Soviet-U.S. relations are not insuperable and that the sides will continue the talks on a radical reduction in nuclear and other arms. Tiang Zhengpei noted that the Chinese side accepts the briefing gratefully.

Work of UN Session on Disarmament Reviewed

Session Chairman Cited

LD1606094888 Moscow TASS in English 0754 GMT 16 Jun 88

[Text] New York June 16 TASS—By TASS correspondent Mikhail Kochetkov:

The recent general discussion at the third special session of the U.N. General Assembly on disarmament reflected the growing awareness in the international community of the need to translate into reality new attitudes towards the question of curbing the arms race on a multilateral basis, Chairman of the special session Peter Florin said in a TASS interview.

The current special session is held at a time of positive changes in the international situation, caused by successful arms reduction talks between the United States and the Soviet Union and the conclusion of the INF Treaty. Progress at talks between the USSR and USA creates a favourable atmosphere for moving ahead in multilateral disarmament as well. This was stressed by the overwhelming majority of speakers during the general discussion, including 24 heads of state and government, six deputy prime ministers and 49 foreign ministers.

Their speeches demonstrated to a considerable degree the commonality of positions of various states on vital issues of disarmament and ensuring international security. The current open and non-confrontational dialogue also helps bring closer together positions on the problems still marked by differences in views. Many concrete proposals were advanced by all groups of states, and they are being considered.

Socialist and non-aligned countries, representatives of a whole number of West European states put forward a series of proposals, close to each other in essence, which is a sign of hope and possibility of reaching an accord on a whole number of disarmament problems.

Florin said that the speech by Eduard Shevardnadze, Soviet foreign minister, evoked wide response, while India's proposals, made in Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi's speech, attracted attention of the international community. Proposals of Scandinavian countries actively promoted progress in the cause of multilateral disarmament.

Reduction and elimination of nuclear armaments, termination of nuclear tests, seen as a barrier to qualitative upgrading of nuclear weapons, earliest conclusion of work on a convention to ban chemical weapons, creation of zones free from nuclear weapons, elimination of foreign military bases, reduction of conventional weapons, prevention of militarization of outer space, creation of an international system of monitoring compliance with disarmament agreements—this is far from complete the list of questions which are broadly discussed today during work on the final document of the special session.

Since that document is to be passed by consensus, this, naturally, creates certain difficulties. However, Peter Florin expressed the hope that they would be overcome during further work of the special session.

Proposal on Naval Arms

LD1606203788 Moscow TASS in English 1900 GMT 16 Jun 88

[Text] New York June 16 TASS—Bulgaria, the GDR and the USSR drew the attention of the delegates of the third special session of the U.N. General Assembly on disarmament to the need for the adoption of concrete measures to limit and reduce arms at sea.

The ending and curtailing the race of naval weapons is made imperative above all by the fact that in the process of disarmament which now covers mainly arms on land, the naval component in the general alignment of forces objectively increases, says the joint working document tabled by the three countries at the special session today.

The sponsors of the document proposed the holding within the United Nations framework, of a multilateral meeting of military experts of major naval powers and other states concerned. The aim of the meeting would be to identify practical approaches to measures of confidence-building, and of limitation and reduction of naval activity and weapons. Such a meeting would contribute to implementing the proposals to convene a special international conference or a Security Council meeting on naval questions.

Bulgaria, the GDR, and the USSR pointed out that prevention of the threat to the freedom of maritime navigation was a direct responsibility of the United Nations. So it is necessary to move from a unilateral staking on naval might in this area over to multilateral collective security measures, to make full use of the U.N. possibilities up to establishing, in specific cases, of a U.N. naval force. It is important to elaborate the practical aspects of setting up a U.N. naval force. Already in the near future it could be possible to hold tentative joint exercises of the navies of the permanent members of the Security Council to practice the maintenance of the freedom of navigation by the U.N. naval force.

Control Agency Proposed

LD1606204488 Moscow TASS in English 1909 GMT 16 Jun 88

[Text] New York June 16 TASS—Delegations of Bulgaria, the USSR and Czechoslovkia at the third special session of the U.N. General Assembly on disarmament have tabled a working document detailing their proposals to set up, under a U.N. aegis, a mechanism for a

broad international control over the implementation of agreements to ease international tensions and to limit arms, and over the military situation in conflict areas. The document says that, as a possible option, consideration could be given to the feasibility of setting up in the future an international control agency.

Such an agency would coordinate and, as appropriate, also monitor compliance with agreements and treaties in specific areas of arms limitations, reductions and liquidation. The agency could also be vested with the function of monitoring compliance with agreements to reduce international tensions.

The efforts to set up such an agency, rather than ruling out, on the contrary presuppose the establishment of bilateral and multilateral systems to control the observance of individual agreements of a military-political nature, the document says.

The document also proposes the formation of a multilateral centre under the U.N. secretary general for assistance in the field of control, which could subsequently be incorporated into that agency or act in a close link with it.

To provide the international community with reliable and diversified information on the observance of the multilateral treaties and agreements in the field of disarmament and reduction of international tensions as well as on the monitoring of the military situation in conflict areas, it could be possible, in developing the idea put forward by France, to embark upon the establishment of an international agency for space supervision which could in the long run become an integral part of the international control agency. The Soviet Union stands ready to consider launching the agency's satellites with Soviet boosters on mutually acceptable conditions.

The co-sponsors of the document express their agreement with the idea of the "Group of Six" to set up a mechanism of international control over nuclear tests and are prepared to participate in its practical implementation, believing that this could become one of the first steps toward the establishment of an international control agency.

NATO 'Caught Unawares'

LD1606145188 Moscow TASS in English 1432 GMT 16 Jun 88

[Text] Moscow June 16 TASS—The new Soviet proposals for reducing conventional armed forces and armaments laid down at the U.N. General Assembly's third special session on disarmament drew wide response in many European countries. However, as the British newspaper GUARDIAN writes, they caught the NATO countries unawares and showed that there were differences in the North Atlantic alliance on this complex issue.

Let us recall the substance of the Soviet proposals. The Soviet side suggests starting with eliminating the existing imbalances and asymmetries on the basis of a reciprocal formal exchange of official data.

This exchange, as was proposed at the Moscow summit meeting, could be done even before the negotiations begin. Once they get under way, the Soviet side proposes that on-site inspections be conducted to check the baseline data and thus to remove differences in assessments. At that stage, ways of eliminating imbalances and asymmetries could be identified and methods of carrying out reductions in thearmed forces and armaments under the most stringent control could also be devised.

The second stage in the negotiations would deal with cutbacks in the armed forces of both sides by approximately 500,000 men each.

At the third stage, further reductions would be made in the armed forces and conventional armaments, the armed forces on both sides would be given a defensive character, and their offensive nucleus would be dismantled.

At all those stages of the negotiations the Soviet side is ready for reductions in offensive arms of all types, including tactical nuclear weapons, attack aircraft and tanks.

Parallel to that discussions could be made on measures for the disengagement of the Warsaw Treaty and NATO forces and the establishment of corridors and zones free from nuclear and chemical weapons.

Intrusive verification, confidence-building measures and renunciation of offensive arms underlie the Soviet proposals. These factors have caught, as the GUARDIAN put it, the NATO countries unawares, haven't they?

Petrovskiy on Proposals

LD1606212688 Moscow TASS in English 2051 GMT 16 Jun 88

[Text] New York June 16 TASS—Special TASS correspondents Vyacheslav Chernyshev and Vitaliy Chukseyev report:

Vladimir Petrovskiy, deputy foreign minister of the USSR, at a press conference at the U.N. Headquarters today concretized the Soviet proposals on the U.N. role in forming a comprehensive system of peace and security.

The establishment of such a system, he said, is conceived as a long-term process, evolving on the basis of the U.N. Charter and within a U.N. framework, and bringing the political conduct of states in line with the realities of the present world—diverse and contradictory, in which,

along with the global threat to the very existence of humankind, there is a potential for cooperation and for the political settlement of acute problems.

Implementation of a number of concrete measures is proposed to enhance the role of the United Nations.

With a view to intensifying the process and achieving nuclear disarmament by the year 2000, a meeting of the Security Council ought to be convened at the level of foreign ministers, and the Geneva conference on disarmament ought to be brought into the consideration of this problem.

To examine the overdue problem of limiting naval activity and arms at sea, the Soviet Union proposes the establishment of a U.N. naval force and the holding, already in the near future, of tentative joint exercises of the navies of the permanent members of the Security Council to practice the maintenance of the freedom of navigation by the U.N. force. In setting another major task—that of liquidating by the year 2000 of military presence and of military bases in foreign territories, the Soviet representative went on to say, we believe that the United Nations could participate in supervising the withdrawal of forces from foreign territories. Where, following the withdrawal of foreign military contingents, the need still remains for the presence of troops, the latter should be represented by the United Nations. In our opinion, it would be quite useful if the states already now agreed to report to the U.N. secretary general data on their miltary presence abroad and on foreign military presence in their territories. Vladimir Petrovskiy also stressed that reporting such data to the United Nations cannot be a "one act theatre" and that all states must take part in this important exercise.

The Soviet Union believes that the time has come to set up, under a U.N. aegis, an international agency for supervision and control whose scope would include agreements not only in the field of disarmament but also in that of a political settlement of conflicts and crises, Petrovskiy further said. A multilateral centre for assistance in the field of control could be set up under the U.N. secretary general, which would dispatch missions to areas of conflict and help participants in bilateral and regional agreements in the matter of control.

The time has come to set up a world space organisation, in addition to the IAEA and other specialized agencies.

The Soviet Union not only tables, for the consideration by the United Nations, proposals to enhance the role and efficacy of the United Nations, but is also unilaterally taking steps with this end in mind, the deputy foreign minister said. We give maximum support to the efforts of the U.N. secretary general in the matters of the political settlement of the situation around Afghanistan, of ending the Iran-Iraq conflict and of de-blocking other conflict situations. We esteem highly the activity of the U.N. Secretariat in the field of disarmament, including, among others, that of the department for disarmament, and consider it necessary to strengthen the role of the Centre for the Reduction of the Nuclear Threat.

The Soviet Union attaches special significance to the U.N. peace-keeping operations. We have adopted measures facilitating a broad utilization of the institutions of the U.N. military observers and of the United Nations peace-keeping forces, including Soviet military personnel who are part of the observers.

The Soviet Union is adopting measures to overcome the budget difficulties that have arisen in the United Nations. We have fully repaid our arrears on the U.N. regular budget and made a first installment of 25 million dollars in repayment of our arrears in financing the costs of the Armed Forces of the organisation. Already early this year we paid a large part of our annual assessed contribution to the U.N. and to the IAEA.

The Soviet Union adopted a new approach to the international civil service, favouring a reasonable combination of permanent and temporary contracts. This restores balance between the principles of competence and of equitable geographical distribution, as laid down in the U.N. Charter, which was clearly tilted to one side.

We are ridding, Vladimir Petrovskiy said, our policy vis-a-vis the organisation of dogmas and a subjective approach but we do not regard this as a privilege which is only ours. We have the right to expect the same self-criticism, sense of responsibility and reasonableness from other states as well. Only in this way shall we be able to help the United Nations to become what it must be under the Charter—a unique centre for harmonizing the actions of states in our interdependent world.

Gerasimov, Shishlin in Foreign Policy Roundtable

LD1506223988 Prague Television Service in Czech 1910 GMT 15 Jun 88

[Roundtable discussion chaired by Jan Zelenka, director general of Czech Television, with Gennadiy Gerasimov, spokesman of the USSR Foreign Ministry; Nikolay Shishlin, deputy chief of the CPSU Central Committee Propaganda Department; and Moravek, head of Czech Television Newsreel's International Department—live or recorded; Gerasimov and Shishlin speak in Russian with superimposed Czech translation; no video available, individual speakers cannot be identified]

[Text] [Zelenka] Good evening, esteemed television viewers. As you can see we have met at the roundtable again with our old acquaintances and this time with Nikolay Shishlin, an official of the CPSU Central Committee, who is already sufficiently known to you, and with Gennadiy Gerasimov, spokesman of the Soviet Ministry of Foreign Affairs, who is known to you from

the regular weekly news conferences in Moscow. At the same time we have with us Comrade Moravek, head of the International Department of the Television Newsreel.

What is it all about? When we have such guests, understandably we want to talk about Soviet foreign policy in connection with the recent talks between Comrade Gorbachev and President Reagan. The viewers know all that went on. We carried transmissions from Moscow of all events. You were also able to read about these events in great detail in our press. Despite this, we are glad to make use of you today, Comrades Shishlin and Gerasimov, for more knowledgable reflections because, as we all know, you were direct witnesses. This is why I would like to open the debate by reflecting on matters which we in television and perhaps in the press, too, have not yet started to reflect.

One round of talks ended. The Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles was concluded and there was a ceremonial exchange of documents. What now? Do you think that it is realistic at all to believe that the next important step, that is, a treaty on strategic missiles, could still be implemented during the term of the Reagan Administration?

[Shishlin] I would like above all to thank Comrade Zelenka for this question because I have grown accustomed, when I am with Gennadiy Gerasimov, to having him talk about foreign affairs while I talk only about domestic matters—although we could swap our places regularly. I tell you frankly that I believe that the chances for achieving a 50-percent reduction of strategic offensive weapons during the current year are not too great. I would assess them at about 30 percent for and 70 percent against. But both sides say that they would like to conclude this treaty. The desire, therefore, exists.

On the other hand, I, of course, agree that we are a very long way apart. The talks in Geneva have shown that there are many technical details with which the experts are unable to cope. Yes, this connection is a correct one. Both Washington and Moscow desire this but, of course, one must understand that very delicate and complex problems are at issue.

What do we have? We have an experience from the conclusion of the Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles. The system of inspection has been worked out. It appears that there is now a willingness to bring about a 50-percent reduction of strategic offensive weapons. And after the Moscow meeting, the U.S. President has been talking about the determination of his administration to progress as far as possible. But the problem of the extremely complicated systems will apparently not allow us to complete the treaty in time. He himself has said that he does not necessarily want to have the treaty by the end of his period of office, that what he wants chiefly is a good treaty. The important thing is that there is continuity, that the next administration should take the baton from the current administration—this does not always happen in the United States. When there is a change of administration they sometimes think that agreements concluded by the previous administration do not have to be too binding for the incoming one. Breaks in continuity do exist in the United States.

[Czech speaker] It is almost a tradition that a new U.S. President at the beginning of his term rejects what has been done by the previous one. True, sometimes it is an illusion, more of a political maneuver, but it makes me wonder whether the new President—who will take up his office quite soon, in 6 months—will weaken the relations between the USSR and the United States and reduce the current level of talks?

[Russian speaker] We hope that this will not happen. The election campaign is going on in the United States at present and, unlike earlier ones, the question of relations with the USSR is not controversial. Neither Vice President Bush nor Massachusetts Governor Dukakis argue about this. However, when the new administration comes into power it will first have to learn a bit about foreign policy, and this takes time. We hope that in this case it will not take long.

[Czech speaker] I think that the election campaign in the United States has still not properly begun, that it will start in [word indistinct], and that it will culminate only after the winter. Only then will the candidates formulate their ideas on foreign policy. Second, it is a trend in the United States to say that President Reagan has changed in some way. But I think that it is not only he who has changed—that in the United States a much greater number of people must have changed and that a certain trend is prevailing which could continue—although perhaps in a weaker form than is the case now.

[Second Czech speaker] I have a question with regard to the new President. It is a fact that so far the candidates, whether Democratic or Republican, have not questioned the current policy with regard to relations with the USSR. However, various views were expressed about the so-called space weapons. Do you think that the next President, whether Republican or Democrat, could influence the next stage or in some way show a different attitude to SDI than Reagan?

[Russian speaker] I would say that SDI is, in particular, a dream of [word indistinct] Reagan. Vice President Bush said 5 years ago, when Reagan declared the Star Wars program: why should we not try to hope that such a system could be created? But I do not think that he is a very zealous supporter of this program. Only last week two statements were issued: one by the Senate commission and the price report of Congress. Both show that nothing will come of this initative, that these are two more nails into the coffin of the SDI. Congress is already

providing less money and the attitude to SDI is changing. After the departure of Reagan, whose dream it is, it will evidently change even more. With regard to Dukakis, he expresses his skepticism quite openly.

So what you have said about the mood in the United States is quite correct. I had the luck to travel for 3 weeks in the United States just a month ago. I saw places which are not visited that often: from Texas, through Arizona to Alaska, to Hawaii. The attitudes toward me were friendly even in places which have a military-industrial complex, with the largest navy base. Alaska ia a very militarized state, and in Hawaii and [word indistinct] I received a very friendly welcome everywhere.

Yes, there is a well-known firm there, [name indistinct], which carries out analyses of public opinion, and as I remember, they compared the public opinion poll of 1986, before Geneva—then, 60 percent of those asked thought that relations between the United States and the USSR were worsening and approximately 24 percent thought that they were improving, and the rest thought that they were remaining the same. In January 1988, 61 percent thought that relations were improving, approximately 30 percent thought they were remaining the same, and the rest thought that they were worsening. It shows that the dynamism of changes of views of the American people is very great. Now the results are simply amazing. The majority of the Americans—and I am sure of that—are favorably disposed toward a radical improvement of Soviet-U.S. relations.

[Zelenka] Regarding the question put by Comrade Moravka about whether the views of other politicians are changing, we could apparently draw the conclusion that the general climate of how the Soviet Union and its relations with the United States are viewed is beginning to change.

[Russian speaker] I agree. After the journey, which lasted 3 weeks, I agree that the relationship has changed rapidly and that Reagan himself has changed. When he was in Moscow—as well as after Moscow—he said many things that were totally new for him. For instance, he no longer describes our country as an evil empire. And I believe that the Americans now see that we are not their adversaries, that we are not their enemies but that we are partners in a very important matter, the matter of joint survival on this planet. And they understand that nuclear disarmament must be on the agenda of the day.

[Moravka] I would like to add that the situation has also changed in that the Americans are now after all a bit more knowledgeable about the Soviet Union.

[Zelenka] Or are beginning to be more knowledgeable.

[Moravka] Or are beginning to be more knowledgeable. There are telebridges; Comrade Gorbachev visited the United States, and there are other contacts which did not exist previously. This means that there is some knowledge. We are not going to debate how big it is—probably not very big as yet. But I believe that it has come at the right time, that the openess of Soviet society is some kind of openess toward American society.

[Shishlin] As an aside, there are more contacts, but I remember that in the seventies when I was a correspondent in the United States, there were many contacts. Detente was taking place at that time and many journalists were writing—perhaps even I wrote it once or twice—that detente was irreversible. But it was reversed. So, relations are a good thing but they themselves do not determine the final climate. I believe that the chief factor in the change of relations with the Soviet Union is our policy of restructuring, that the change has come about because of that policy. That is the main factor. And I would like to add that the Americans have been compelled to reckon with these realities they have encountered. I have in mind, in particular, their budget deficit as well as the fact that the United States has changed from a previous creditor to the biggest debtor in the world. In addition, the United States has lost its first place on the world market. Thus, it is being shown that the arms race, too, is untenable for American pockets. I believe that Gennadiy will agree with me that judging from the course of the current presidential campaign, judging from the moods prevailing in the United States, the axis of political life is being shifted to the center. Right-wing forces have little chance. Yes, I asked many of my partners what they were thinking about it, and they said: With your restructuring you could soon find yourselves occupying second place in the world, after Japan.

[Czech speaker] There are also certain changes in President Reagan's views, particularly in the fact that he has publicly withdrawn his statement that the Soviet Union is an evil empire. Nevertheless, I would like to take up some negative features which attract attention in Czechoslovakia too. In addition to having direct talks with Comrade Gorbachev, President Reagan also undertook other activities, for example, he invited to the U.S. Embassy in Moscow so-called dissidents. Don't you think that despite all your tolerance which we have noticed, the President, as a guest of the Soviet Union, nevertheless overstepped the mark a bit, or went too far?

[Russian speaker] I think that here he lost his sense of tact a little. Since the President likes Russian proverbs, I had prepared a few Russian proverbs, but I didn't use those proverbs because in the end the President, in his free time, can choose whatever company he likes. He also invited Soviet journalists to that meeting, and later even the U.S. correspondents told me that they were surprised that this meeting was reported in the Soviet press. The people there were very different. For example, a former fascist collaborator who now, after serving his sentence, uses his freedom to behave like this.

[Czech speaker] We know that Academician Sakharov, whom the West considers a dissident, was not invited to this meeting. So who was invited? Who is a dissident in the Soviet Union today?

[Shishlin] It is probably better not to speak about this question, because I am not the official representative of the Foreign Ministry. Gennadiy Gerasimov here, as an official representative, has to (?defend) the U.S. ambassador to some extent. I believe that U.S. Ambassador Matlock clearly made a mistake and invited rather dubious company. It gives the same kind of impression as if Gorbachev went to the United States with a soup kitchen and dished out soup to all those who need the soup kitchens for the poor. The United States is still harping on the same old theme, that of so-called human rights in our country. We cannot say so-called rights. Dissidents do exist, and so do human rights. We have our own human rights, and of course in our country there are also violations of these rights. Yes, IZVESTIYA has written that there have been cases of human rights violations, and we must establish a socialist legal (?system). But that is another issue, and in this respect we do not need lessons from anyone else.

[Czech speaker] I'll come back to Comrade Gorbachev's talks with President Reagan. As was shown at Comrade Gorbachev's press conference, President Reagan evidently rejected some new proposals of the USSR. Do you think that this means that the reduction was not as you expected with regard to the main issue, that is, the problem of disarmament?

[Russian speaker] Of course, we would like more, but we still think that the meeting was useful. I believe that its significance is in particular psychological. What matters is the change in atmosphere in the world under the influence of enthusiasm over the USSR-U.S. agreements. It is not accidental that British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher said that the time of negative assessment has passed and that now is the time of positive relations. This does not look like anything specific but in fact this is a great change in mood.

With regard to our proposals, we have for example submitted a proposal on the reduction of the state of armaments and of armed forces in Europe. This should take place in three stages. The United States and the West as such claim that the Warsaw Pact countries are greatly superior in armed forces. We propose to exchange data, to find this lack of balance, and to remove it and then reduce armed forces by 500,000 men and deploy them so that they would have a purely defensive nature. The Americans said: This is not a proposal for us; it is for Vienna. Then the next issue was discussed, the principle of peaceful coexistence. It was not formulated exactly in these words, but in a similar way. It was rather a stormy discussion. The Americans asked for time to think matters over. They went on the side at the Georgiyevskiy Zal, and they did not sit down again and continued the deliberation standing up. Reagan said: You know, my advisers say that we cannot accept it although it looked like quite a harmless formula. They did not explain why. Yes, later on in the press they mentioned it. Obviously they thought it over further afterward.

[Czech speaker] I am taking advantage of the fact that both of you, Comrade Shishlin and Comrade Gerasimov, have been present at the Gorbachev-Reagan talks from the very beginning, from the very first to the very last talk. Could you tell us to what extent do you see the difference in the character of these talks from the first to the fourth round, as you witnessed them all?

[Gerasimov] The first was Geneva, then Reykjavik, then Washington, and finally Moscow. This is an ascending line, toward the top, to commonsense. At the first meeting I was a correspondent, only an observer. At the second, third, and fourth meetings I was a participant. The first meeting was getting acquainted. However, it still led to agreeing with the idea that nuclear war is not possible and cannot be waged. This was the beginning. Reykjavik, it seemed, was a failure, yet it created the basis for further progress on nuclear disarmament. Washington gave us a treaty, and Moscow gave us not only the completion of the job—the exchange of ratification documents—but also the atmosphere of the need to continue on the path of nuclear disarmament and of disarmament as such. I know that Nikolay will agree.

[Shishlin] Yes, I agree and want to point out one detail of the Moscow meeting. Some political commentators complain now that it yielded no sensational events. But this is actually the main sensational event. It shows that relations are becoming balanced, that they are becoming healthier, and that they are changing over from the previous base of hostility and distrust to the base of realism.

There are still problems. We have heard very good assessment from Mrs Thatcher and other leading Western officials. President Reagan himself is satisfied. But Carlucci, his defense secretary, and national security adviser Powell cooled the atmosphere and started to say that the USSR remains the greatest enemy and that it has enormous military force. Carlucci immediately went to Japan and demanded the increased defense [word indistinct]. This was discussed recently at the NATO council session. All in all, the fight is still going on. There is a military-industrial complex in the United States. We have not made this up, it was the idea of President Eisenhower. President Reagan believes it does not exist. We however realize that some forces are not interested in disarmament.

I think that there is also another essential contribution of the meeting. For a long time Soviet-U.S. relations were based on negativism. They were divided by the arms race (?which had) a negative impact. It was in Moscow that for the first time a new element appeared in the talks:

The two sides were not blaming each other but were trying to come to a realization that what is necessary is at least parallel actions, if not joint ones.

Also what happened in Moscow—Gennadiy has already mentioned it—the psychological atmosphere was really different. And then there was the dramatic moment when Reagan said, when taking leave in Georgiyevskiy Zal, that his relation to Mr and Mrs Gorbachev is that of a friend. It was not only an emotional moment. Here was a man who was taking leave of his pleasant hosts. There was, however, something more in it too. The main cosequence of the Moscow meeting is the fact that the cold war is on the way out and is ending. Some people in the West do not agree with this, such as Zbigniew Brzezinski and also Kissinger who say: The cold war remains; the USSR is still enemy number one. The polemics continue.

[Czech speaker] If you will allow me, I will now bring Czechoslovak policy into it. We follow a great deal the entire policy of which Comrade Gorbachev says: Let us build our common European house. Czechoslovakia has put forward a proposal, announced by Comrade Jakes, our general secretary, for creating a zone of confidence along the border between NATO and the Warsaw Pact. You surely know the content of this proposal. Do you think that this proposal could help significantly in building this European house and mutual trust?

[Russian speaker] Yes. After all, we say that our proposal on how to proceed at all stages does not exclude other ideas at all. Rather it welcomes them, including the idea about which you have been talking. These are good proposals. The West in effect does not have reasons for rejecting them. They say they are afraid of an attack by Soviet tanks and by Warsaw Pact troops in general. But if there were to be a corridor where forces would be disengaged this would be far more difficult. I would like to remind you that at the third special session of the UN General Assembly Prague's initiative was stressed not only in the speech by the Czechoslovak representative but also in the speech made by our foreign minister, Comrade Shevardnadze. The Soviet Union naturally does not possess a monopoly of initiative and truth. All Soviet foreign policy is developed as a policy that reflects the views of our allies and our friends, and it is corrected by them.

[Czech speaker] Let me come back to one question which was also on the agenda at Moscow, and that is the question of Afghanistan. The Geneva accords have been secured and the withdrawal of the Soviet Army from Afghanistan is taking place. However, it turns out that Pakistan is not fulfilling these accords. First, can you tell me precisely in what respect Pakistan is not fulfilling these accords? And second, could this state of affairs affect the withdrawal of the Soviet troops from Afghanistan?

[Russian speaker] Under the agreement with Afghanistan, Pakistan—and Afghanistan too, incidentally—undertook not to interfere in the internal affairs of the other party and not to try to bring about a change in the government in the other country. Now we see that Pakistan is supporting and encouraging the armed opposition. It is providing them with arms on a very extensive scale; It is supplying weapons; It is about to open an Afghan information agency in Peshawar which will represent this armed opposition. In other words, it is clearly violating its undertakings.

Why is it doing this? Well, there are a number of reasons. Pakistan receives U.S. aid for itself too; In addition, the Afghan rebels also represent a considerable force in Pakistan and they want to rule. But this is definitely a violation, we have already spoken about this several times, and we have said that the United States is partly to blame for this. And we have pointed out that this could lead to certain consequences. However, the schedule for the withdrawal of our troops is being maintained. In addition, the response to this was given in the meeting the day before yesterday between Comrade Gorbachev and the Afghan President Najibullah. Of course, the continuing interference into Afghanistan's affairs brings a new element into the situation in which it will be necessary to review that situation, even though we would be loath to do this.

[Zelenka] Let us assume that the withdrawal of the troops will be completed. How do you view the situation? What, in your view, is the likely turn of events in Afghanistan? Incidentally, Comrade Moravek, I can confirm that this question has been asked by very many viewers, generally worried viewers, in their letters to us.

[Russian speaker] The only path is the policy of national reconciliation, because otherwise there will be a bloody civil war. President Najibullah says that his government is strong enough to withstand the armed opposition, but at the same time he appeals to the opposition to take part in government. He is willing to hand over a large number of ministerial posts to representatives of the opposition in order to seek peace through national reconciliation. Otherwise the civil war will continue and the Afghan people are tired.

[Moravek] I would say that the important thing is the way in which the government gets its act together, because it cannot now rely on someone else solving its problems for it; it has to solve them itself. And as Comrade Gerasimov said, it must negotiate with all sections of the population, and if it manages this, it will resolve the situation by itself.

[Russian speaker] I would like to add a couple of words on this point. I understand why the viewers ask this question. We are all asking the same question, because the turn of events in Afghanistan can lead to a number of options, it can take a number of paths. On the other hand, what we see in Afghanistan is not one, not two, but

a number of different political forces: There is Najibullah's government, the legal power in the Afghan Republic; there is the strong armed opposition in which the Peshawar seven play an important role; then there are armed opposition factions which are not connected with the Peshawar seven and which operate on Afghan territory. The latest information indicates that the influence of these factions, these groups, is increasing in Afghan affairs. We must be honest: As we have already said, there is also an external influence here on the Afghan situation—external interventions, and when you look at the political equation, you can see that it is an equation which contains a number of unknown factors. It is difficult to say that having said one thing, that is what will in fact happen. No, unfortunately today we can solve this equation in a desirable way only to a limited degree of probability, and that is along the path of consistent implementation of the policy of national reconciliation. As I have said, interference in the internal affairs of Afghanistan will obviously put the Soviet Union in a new situation in which the Soviet Union will be obliged to rethink the equation I have referred to.

[Czech speaker] One more question to which our viewers have drawn our attention. After the Moscow meeting, Secretary Shultz left for the Middle East to have talks with various politicians. As we heard recently on the news or read in the press, Comrade Shevardnadze also had certain talks with some Middle East politicians during the current session of the UN General Assembly. Is this the result, or are these steps connected with the talks held during the summit meeting on this issue, on this regional problem?

[Russian speaker] Regional problems were really discussed during the Moscow summit. But this is not a followup on that summit but rather a continuation and search for opportunities to resolve the matter.

Shultz had his plan. This was, I believe, his fourth visit in this context. He went there for the fourth time after the Moscow summit and a visit to Brussels. But his plans have not been accepted even by Israel. Shamir is against the plan. So I believe that it will be necessary to return to the joint concept of an international conference with the participation of all interested parties, with the participation of PLO representatives and with the participation of members, all permanent members of the Security Council.

As regards the meeting between Comrade Shevardnadze and Mr Shamir, this was one of many meetings with various politicians, and we do not have to agree with all of them. That meeting lasted 2 hours. Shamir said that he opposes a multilateral conference, and that he favors bilateral talks. Comrade Shevardnadze asked him: Well, if bilateral talks were to be held, would you be willing to return land to the Palestinians? But Israel does not have a clear-cut concept on how to tackle the situaiton. It only wants to delay things since time is working against it.

[Czech speaker] Let me discuss the last topic. The CPSU conference is approaching. There are no doubts that these foreign policy issues will be discussed there too, and that the USSR's foreign policy will be considered. In your view, which foreign policy issue will become the main topic when Soviet foreign policy is discussed at the conference?

[Russian speaker] There are no secrets here. The Central Committee thesis on the party conference has already been published, and the most important conclusion has already been drawn. We think that our socialist friends share it. We have redirected our policy into new political thinking, and thus we were able to change the negative trends in the process of foreign political life and to distance ourselves a bit from that very dangerous brink on which we found ourselves. We are coming to the party conference with the already verified practice of strategic line in the sphere of foreign policy. Our experience shows that the matter of priority for us is to consolidate mutual relations among the socialist friends. Our results would be much more modest if Soviet foreign policy did not also include the ideas of our socialist allies. Our joint orientation is to continue and strive for better results and to aim for a radical improvement of the world situation, because we live in a world that is mutually interlinked and mutually dependant, and we have one choice only.

[Czech speaker] Thank you again for today's discussion. I thank Nikolay Shishlin and Gennadiy Gerasimov. We finish the discussion. See you again, our dear guests!

Delegate Addresses ILO Session on Human Rights

PM1606133588 Moscow TRUD in Russian 8 Jun 88 p 5

[Special correspondent V. Boykov dispatch: "International Labor Organization: Debate on Rights"]

[Text] Geneva, 7 Jun—The 75th session of the ILO General Conference has now been under way for 1 week in Geneva. Approximately 2,000 delegates from almost 150 countries are taking part in it. They represent the "triangle" of governments, trade unions, and entrepreneurs.

The plenary sessions are continuing to discuss the main topic of the present general conference, which is formulated as follows: "Human rights are a common responsibility." The speakers call upon the ILO to combat unemployment and social injustice more purposefully and vigorously.

The speakers do not forget the basic right—the right to a peaceful life—without which other rights lose all meaning.

J. Vanderveken, general secretary of the ICFTU, urged delegates to do everything to "give mankind a chance to live with dignity in freedom and peace."

"Can human rights be combined with the threat to use means of universal destruction? The world cannot be considered secure if people in it disregard a basic human right—the right to life," L.A. Kostin, head of the Soviet delegation and first deputy chairman of the USSR State Committee for Labor and Social Problems, noted in his speech.

L.A. Kostin mentioned that the Soviet Union was one of the co-authors of the UN Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and is a party to international human rights pacts. Provisions concerning human rights from the Helsinki Final Act have been incorporated as an integral part of the USSR Constitution—something that not all the members of the conference have done. The USSR views the development, adoption, and observance of international labor norms as one of the most important areas in the activity of this organization and is prepared to do its utmost to promote its development in an atmosphere of honest, multilateral dialogue.

We, the Soviet delegation head continued, are open to any constructive exchange of opinions. The proposal made by M.S. Gorbachev at the recent Moscow talks to U.S. President R. Reagan to broaden discussion on human rights is a recent illustration of this. In general our country has something to offer with regard to its historic achievements in guaranteeing human rights.

Broad exchange of opinions both within the country and also between states is assuming great importance given countries' and also individuals' different approaches to and understanding of human rights, L.A. Kostin stressed. These questions are now being discussed extensively within the Soviet Union, in particular, via the mass media. A mechanism for international cooperation in the human rights sphere is gradually taking shape. An accord exists regarding the creation of a permanent human rights organ involving USSR Supreme Soviet deputies and U.S. congressmen.

In the course of the restructuring being implemented in the USSR the rights of working people are being broadened and the process of developing democracy, glasnost, and self-management is under way. Violations of laws and rights do occur. The courts, for instance, reinstate approximately one-half of all dismissed workers who believe the actions of the administration and the trade union organs to have been unwarranted. The Law on the Procedure for Appeals to the Courts Against Unlawful Actions by Officials Infringing Citizens' Rights was adopted and entered into force this January with a view to more effectively defending working people's interests.

L.A. Kostin noted in his speech the need to create favorable international conditions in order to solve the problems of indebtedness, employment, and the democratization of interstate economic relations.

The Soviet Union, he said, invariably supports developing countries in their struggle to achieve true economic independence and equality. They must be offered all manner of assistance in their socioeconomic development. The Soviet delegation head expressed the hope that in the light of the Geneva agreements on the settlement of questions surrounding Afghanistan, the ILO will offer this republic the necessary aid within its sphere of competence. For its part, L.A. Kostin stressed in conclusion, the USSR is prepared to make due efforts in this area.

The Geneva debate on human rights continues.

Silayev Attends European Standards Meeting

PM1606135188 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 14 Jun 88 Second Edition p 2

[TASS report: "Strengthening Mutual Understanding"]

[Excerpt] Quality, progress, and savings were the theme of the 32d annual conference of the European Quality Control Organization, which opened 13 June in Moscow's International Trade Center.

The conference participants were sent a greetings message by N.I. Ryzhkov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers. The message was read out by I.S. Silayev, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers. [Passage omitted]

More on Demichev Talk With International Lawyers

PM1706084388 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 14 Jun 88 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report under the general heading: "Friendly Conversations"]

[Text] On 13 June P.N. Demichev, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, had a conversation in the Kremlin with Swedish parliamentary Deputy S. Gustafsson, USSR General Prosecutor A.Ya. Sukharev, and U.S. lawyer P. Weiss, cochairmen of the International Association of Lawyers Against Nuclear Weapons.

P.N. Demichev told the guests about the progress of restructuring in the country's economic and social life and reminded them of the latest Soviet foreign policy peace initiatives. He stressed that these two spheres of our state's activity are closely related. Soviet people, engaged in peaceful creative labor, have a vital interest in the stabilization of the international situation and in the development of mutual understanding and good-neighborliness with all the peoples.

Emphasis was placed on the important role of international law in the regulation of mutual relations between different states and strict monitoring of the fulfillment of international agreements and pledges.

P.N. Demichev wished the new organization of lawyers, set up in April this year, success in its noble activities—in the struggle for a nuclear-free and nonviolent world.

The guests expressed a high opinion of the results of the Moscow summit which marked the entry into force of the Treaty on Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles. In their view, the first step in the destruction of intermediate-range and shorter-range missiles should be followed by specific measures to cut strategic offensive weapons and chemical and conventional types of armaments. They stressed that war, in particular nuclear war, must be removed completely from the life of mankind.

V.V. Tereshkova, member of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, participated in the conversation.

France, Iran Restore Diplomatic Relations
PM1606120588 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 16 Jun 88 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Relations Restored"]

[Text] Paris, 15 Jun—France and Iran have decided to restore diplomatic relations. This was announced today by a French Foreign Ministry official spokesman. The countries will exchange ambassadors in the very near future.

United States & Canada

Rogov Eyes Changes in Relations With U.S.

PM1606145188 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 14 Jun 88 Second Edition p 4

[Doctor of Historical Sciences S. Rogov article under "Echo of the Moscow Meeting" rubric: "USSR-U.S.: Balance of Forces or Balance of Interests?"]

[Text] The fourth meeting in the last 3 years between M.S. Gorbachev and R. Reagan was an important contribution to the continuation and broadening of the difficult but vitally important Soviet-U.S. dialogue. What is its aim? Is it possible for Soviet-U.S. relations to develop normally and stably? Sometimes one hears it said that the USSR and the United States are simply doomed to confrontation. However, there have been different periods in the history of Soviet-U.S. relations. There was the military clash when the United States took part in the foreign intervention against the young Soviet republic. There were periods of "non-recognition" and "cold war." Yet common sense nonetheless prevailed at crucial stages, and a thaw in relations began. Moreover, in 1941-1945, the USSR and the United States were allies in the struggle against the common threat of fascism and militarism.

Thus history illustrates that conflict between the United States and the USSR is not inevitable.

Nevertheless, for virtually the entire postwar period, the military strong-arm approach dominated in Washington in relations with the USSR. The arms race and creation of a balance of forces favorable for the United States were not only a means but also an end in themselves for imperialist ruling circles. However, they were unable to tip the military balance in their favor. At the same time, it turned out that the United States' own potential was by no means limitless. The state debt attained incredible dimensions and became the number one national problem. The problem of the decline in U.S. competitiveness on the world market also arose.

At the same time, the futility of implementing the policy of a balance of forces based on nuclear weapons became clear. The bankruptcy of the concept put forward by certain U.S. armchair theoreticians, whereby a gain for one side automatically means a loss for the other, and vice versa, was revealed. The point is that continuation of the position-of-strength policy entails an increase in nuclear parity and an increase in the threat for both sides, creating a situation in which strategic stability becomes stability of the arms race, and instability of security and parity ceases to be a factor in military-political deterrence [sderzhivaniye].

The Soviet Union countered the doctrine on which the policy of strength was based with the concept of a balance of interests and mutual security. The bold initiatives put forward by our country's leadership opened a way out of the impasse into which the policy of confrontation leads.

Soviet-U.S. relations have recently begun to assume a more dynamic character. A serious dialogue is under way on the entire spectrum of interaction between the two countries' interests. The first-ever agreement on the destruction of two classes of nuclear arms—intermediate- and shorter-range missiles—was a practical result of these talks. A real prospect has emerged of concluding an agreement on a 50-percent reduction in strategic nuclear arms on condition that the sides observe the ABM Treaty. Nevertheless, there are still various possible developments of events.

What is necessary for a radical breakthrough? In my opinion, a qualitative change in the nature of USSR-U.S. relations and a shift toward collaboration on the basis of a balance of the sides' interests are necessary. This requires mutual compromises and mutually advantageous agreements based on consideration of one's own national interests and respect for the partner's legitimate interests. This balance of interests does not mean the cessation of rivalry. Rivalry stems from the differences of an ideological and socioeconomic nature between the two states. However, first, rivalry must be conducted exclusively by peaceful means. And second, Soviet-U.S. contradictions must not be absolutized nor USSR-U.S. relations viewed solely from the viewpoint of the struggle between the two systems. Parallel and joint interests must be given priority, and the sphere of conflicting and divergent interests must be substantially narrowed.

This gives rise to the need to put an end to the myths and propaganda stereotypes depicting the other side as "absolute evil" and to discard the outmoded "enemy image." It must be acknowledged that each people has the right to independently choose their path of development.

As for ideological relations, they cannot be reduced to a "war of ideas." On the one hand, an ideological argument cannot be resolved by force of arms, especially nuclear arms. Ideological differences must not be transferred to the sphere of interstate relations. On the other hand, the substance of ideology is not confined to the class element; aspects common to all mankind are also invariably found in the hierarchy of ideological values. It must not be forgotten that Marxism-Leninism did not appear in a vacuum but arose on the highway of world culture and absorbed many of the achievements of human reason. The general human imperative of survival in the nuclear space age does not require the abandonment of class interests but deprives philosophical relations of confrontational absolutism and creates not only poles of repulsion but also areas of consensus and mutual enrichment with advanced values.

USSR and U.S. joint interests are displayed most graphically today, however paradoxical this may seem, in the sphere of security. This sphere—traditionally a source of conflicts—now extremely convincingly demonstrates the fallaciousness of the one-sided, strong-arm approach and, furthermore, the suicidal nature of attempts to ensure one's own security at the expense of the other side. Today a rational course in the military sphere demands reasonable sufficiency rather than superiority. The security of the USSR and the United States can only be mutual.

It is indicative that, having created a vast potential for destruction capable of destroying one another many times over, the two great powers are today forced to hold talks at which they discuss the quantitative and qualitative characteristics of their arms with a view to reducing and eliminating them. A future mechanism to coordinate the sides' interests in the security sphere is gradually beginning to emerge. Within its framework, the USSR and the United States will have to proceed toward a joint understanding of what level of arms each side can consider sufficient from the viewpoint of the legitimate interests of its defense. The present level of nuclear arms could be reduced by 95 percent in phases and conventional forces and arms reduced to the minimum necessary limits without detriment to either side's security. In the course of this process the "deficit of trust" could be eliminated and reliable preconditions created for the transition to a nuclear-free and nonviolent world.

The sphere of security (prevention of war) is not the only sphere for cooperation. Many global problems of the day affect USSR and U.S. joint and parallel interests. Take, for instance, the ecological crisis. Currently every country resolves ecological problems largely independently or, more precisely, in parallel. But it is evident that here, as in the opening up of space and the struggle against starvation and disease, efforts need to be coordinated and pooled.

It must also be stressed (and this is often forgotten) that USSR and U.S. economic interests do not conflict with one another, and it is economic contradictions which often serve as the source of political and military conflicts. Today it is not the Soviet Union but Japan and West European countries that are the United States' main economic competitors.

In aspiring to the role of active participant in world economic ties, the Soviet Union is by no means striving to "oust" the United States and infringe U.S. economic interests in various parts of the globe. Our program for international economic security repudiates the methods of neocolonialism but does not require historically based, legitimate economic ties to be broken. Restructuring in the Soviet Union and the acceleration of our economic development pose no threat to anyone. On the contrary, the greater the success we achieve in realizing the potential contained in the socialist economy, the greater will be our contribution to the stability and progress of the world economy and the broadening of the world market.

USSR-U.S. trade and economic ties do not at present occupy a proper place in relations between the two countries. Granted, there are real possibilities for increasing the volume of trade several times over. Great potential also lies in plans to set up joint enterprises. The development of economic ties objectively benefits both sides.

Of course, regional conflicts are an important source of instability in Soviet-U.S. relations. Unfortunately, postwar history illustrates that acute clashes between USSR and U.S. political interests were often linked with knotty problems in the "Third World." Soviet-U.S. contradictions were often directly "projected" onto regional situations. It is well known that in the seventies this played a negative role for the fate of detente. Today the new political thinking necessitates a new approach to regional seats of tension. It is becoming clear that not only a nuclear war but any war cannot be a means of policy. The policy of national reconciliation is the expression of the new political thinking. Naturally, there is also a need for "rules of conduct" for the great powers, rules which would envisage the renunciation of the use of force with regard to the peoples of developing countries and the renunciation of the export of revolution and counterrevolution. At the same time, the USSR and the United States can play an important positive role by stimulating the process of a peaceful settlement and act in the role of its guarantors. The Geneva agreements on Afghanistan create a precedent for this kind of constructive collaboration.

Thus, real preconditions exist for finding a stable balance of interests between the United States and the Soviet Union. At the Moscow meeting on 31 May, M.S. Gorbachev said: "I see a future in which the USSR and the United States will build their relations not on the basis of deterrence [ustrasheniye] and the improvement of military potentials but on the basis of disarmament, a balance of interests, and comprehensive cooperation."

Both countries are today faced with complex problems in resolving pressing internal tasks. This demands a sober assessment of their capabilities and interests and a realistic approach to foreign policy. Definite changes in favor of realism have emerged recently in U.S. political life. A public opinion poll held this spring showed that 76 percent of Americans favor "cooperation in solving problems" between the United States and the USSR. This enables us to hope that the edifice of Soviet-U.S. relations may be placed on a reliable foundation, which will make it possible to put an end to the period of Soviet-U.S. confrontation and move on to a model of

cooperative collaboration between the USSR and the United States and all mankind based on a balance of the interests of all sides in the interests of mutual security on the planet.

U.S. Looking for 'Loopholes' in Afghan Accords

LD1606141988 Moscow TASS in English 1405 GMT 16 Jun 88

[Text] Moscow June 16 TASS—By TASS commentator Valeriy Vavilov:

Those opposed to a political settlement concerning Afghanistan on the basis of the Geneva accords are obviously irked by the prospect of peace in that long-suffering country and of an end to the fratricidal war there and to the related regional conflict.

This has been confirmed by the latest move by two prominent American senators, Robert Byrd and Robert Dole, who consider it "imperative for the United States to manifest continued support and implement effective coordination with the resistance" in Afghanistan.

With this aim, they have sent a letter to Secretary of State George Shultz, proposing that an ambassador at large be named for Afghanistan as "a focal point for monitoring resistance activities and coordinating U.S. policies and programs with the resistance".

What does this mean? The United States, which maintains diplomatic relations with Afghanistan and keeps a plenipotentiary diplomatic representative in Kabul, wants to open yet another diplomatic mission, this time in the Afghan armed opposition camp.

Where would it be though? Will it perhaps be in Pakistan's Peshawar where the "Alliance of the Seven" still has its headquarters in violation of the Geneva agreements or will it be right in Islamabad which is, too, readily behind that opposition seeking to overthrow the lawful government in Kabul?

It is hard to understand the position held by the Washington figures. The declaration on international guarantees has, after all, been signed by the U.S. secretary of state as well and it binds the signatory nations "to invariably refrain from any form of interference and intervention in the internal affairs of the Republic of Afghanistan...."

The sponsors of the latest "initiative" apparently are unwilling to reckon with the fact that Washington has special responsibility, as one of the guarantors of the Geneva agreements, for their unfailing observance by all the signatories, including Pakistan.

As a result of continued Washington's backing for the opposition in the form of ever further supplies of newest American weapons, the situation now is complicated and tense.

As it feels the support of Washington and Islamabad, the armed opposition has stepped up its activities, training combat groups in Pakistani territory with the assistance of U.S. and Pakistani instructors and sending such groups into Afghanistan to commit acts of terrorism.

One such group yesterday fired rockets on residential areas in Kabul again, killing seven civilians, including women and children.

It is obviously in the same vein that the new American envoy proposed by the senators will "instruct" the Afghan opposition, undercutting the agreements.

The Geneva agreements open the way to an early peace settlement and to an end to bloodletting. To achieve these goals, the parties to the agreements must strictly adhere to their spirit and letter and not look for any loopholes and any detours to bypass the accords.

Reagan Seeks Renewed Military Aid for Contras

LD1606174588 Moscow TASS in English 1733 GMT 16 Jun 88

[Text] Washington June 16 TASS—By TASS correspondent Nikolay Turkatenko:

President Reagan has urged resumed military supplies to Nicaraguan contras.

Speaking in an interview with a group of American and foreign reporters Wednesday, he said they were currently being discussed with contra representatives here.

The chief executive expressed discontent with the position of law-makers as "the efforts that have been made in the Congress succeeded in reducing and eliminating our ability to help the freedom fighters (and) that has literally given a signal to the Sandinists that they can continue to hold out".

Reagan claimed at the same time that the United States kept supporting the joint efforts of Central American nations to settle the conflict in the region.

The President's remarks drew special attention from local observers because some members of congress campaigning for a continued war against Nicaragua were meeting with contras on the same day.

Those legislators called on Reagan to make another request to congress for funding for military aid to the contras.

A resumption of that kind of supplies was urged Wednesday also by U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz under the pretext that it would allegedly give a fillip to talks between the Sandinists and the contras.

This position of the administration and the backers of its policy toward Nicaragua in Congress is seen here, however, as betraying a desire to scuttle those talks so as to resume armed aggression against Nicaragua, despite strong opposition from most members of Congress and most Americans in general.

Kornilov on VOA's 'Vicious Allegations'

LD1606202488 Moscow TASS in English 1953 GMT 16 Jun 88

[Text] Moscow June 16 TASS—TASS political news analyst Yuriy Kornilov writes:

Whenever an act of terror takes place, definite circles in the USA immediately start accusing of terrorism those countries whose political course does not suit Washington. This was shown again by a recent Voice of America broadcast. With a reference to a certain "study" by the U.S. Department of State, the Voice of America declared that from one-third to a half of all victims of terrorist actions in 1987 were those killed or wounded as a result of bomb explosions in Pakistan. Who is to blame for this? According to the Voice of America, these explosions were staged by the "Afghan regime with Soviet backing."

These vicious allegations are aimed not only at casting a slur on the peaceful foreign policy course of Kabul and Moscow that declare for an early settlement of the "Afghan problem". They clearly have the purpose to distract the attention of the public from real causes and origins of terrorism. Meanwhile it is no secret what these causes are: International terrorism sprang up and continues to exist above all because of banking of the imperialist circles on force, because of the Washington's [as received] policy of neo-globalism whose architects view almost the whole world as a sphere of their "vital interests."

It is precisely with the United States neo-globalist policy that a tense, unstable situation in Pakistan is largely connected. Washington's efforts have turned that country into a United States' military-strategic place d'armes in Asia. Pakistan has been inundated with U.S. armaments. Units of insurgents trained and armed on U.S. funds are based in Pakistan and operate virtually without any control. Pakistan is teeming with CIA agents who are closely linked, specifically, with the narcotics ring. There is no wonder that the crime rate is rapidly growing in Pakistan in this atmosphere and there is freedom of action for all kinds of extremist groups.

Pakistan now is also a bridgehead from which adherents and followers of the neo-globalist doctrines, grossly violating the Geneva accords on Afghanistan, continue interfering in the affairs of that sovereign country, back and encourage extremists, supplying them with armaments of U.S. makes. The results of this are known: These are rocketry shelling of residential quarters of Kabul, and explosions in the streets of the Afghan capital of dynamite trucks brought from Pakistan, and piratic raids on Soviet troops. What is this if not real terrorism?

A lot of other facts can be mentioned of which the Voice of America keeps silent, but which indicate that the dangerous concepts of neo-globalism built up in Washington have not been discarded. This is indicated, for instance, by the continued threats against Nicaragua, the United States' backing for Israeli occupiers who perpetrate arbitrariness and terror against the Palestinian people, the encouragement of South African racists by Washington.

The Voice of America broadcast in question was aired at a time when the muddy ways of "Irangate" are rising in Washington again. An interview given by the President of the United States to a group of foreign television journalists last year indicated that the secret supplies of U.S. armaments to Iran implemented by Washington in violation of American laws and behind the back of the Congress were meant also as a kind of "pay" for the release of American hostages. The President said that there exists a terroristic group named Hezbollah which maintains contacts with Iran. So those persons have been told by the USA that if they use their influence to release American hostages they will be supplied with American armaments. How can such clandestine operations go together with the calls of the Voice of America to put an end to terrorism? And one more thing. Director of the United States Information Agency Charles Wick who was recently in Moscow and also visited TASS, just wrote in THE WASHINGTON POST that Moscow agrees that misinformation is incompatible with new thinking. Such is really our conviction. But isn't it time that the Voice of America of which Mr. Wick is in charge should stop being engaged in misinformation?

Reagan Remarks on Baltic Republics Deplored

LD1606210088 Moscow TASS in English 2022 GMT 16 Jun 88

[Text] Vilnius June 16 TASS—The latest proclamation by the U.S. President on the Soviet Baltic republics, this time on the occasion of the so-called "Baltic Freedom Day" increases doubt whether Ronald Reagan reads in advance documents of this kind, which are prepared by his aides. This is the opinion of 50-year old Vaclovas Sakalauskas, chairman of "Teviske" ("native land") Society for cultural ties with the compatriots abroad.

I spent four years in diplomatic service in the USA and sometimes I read, as part of my duties, letters addressed to the Soviet Embassy by senators and congressmen on the allegedly calamitous position of the Lithuanian people, Sakalauskas noted. When I addressed the authors of these letters I could quite often hear as follows: The senator (or representative) requests apology, since he is not well versed in these affairs and recommends to address his aides, who prepared the documents at the request of the electorate.

This is also the case with the President's proclamation on the alleged enslavement of the peoples of the Soviet Baltic republics, Sakalauskas continued. Lithuania is often visited by the U.S. citizens, among them quite a large number of Lithuanians, they can see with their own eyes that the Lithuanian people are free, that their culture flowers, that their native tongue is spoken in streets, at schools and theatres. Does President Reagan know about that?

We do not conceal the fact that we have no few problems. There are also outstanding issues in the field of national relations. Now these problems are being openly discussed in the press, rallies and meetings in the course of the drive for a renovation of the Soviet society. On May 21 and June 14, meetings in tribute to the memory of victims of Stalin's arbitrary rule were held in Vilnius. The government of the republic has approved of the public initiative that a monument to thse victims be put up. Measures are taken to improve the standards of learning the Lithuanian language.

"Lithuania, in common with the whole Soviet public, welcome President Reagan's visit to the USSR", Sakalauskas said. "The results of the summit meeting are a source of optimism. We would not wish that they be marred by such statements which constitute, on top of that, interference in the life of the sovereign Soviet republics."

Supreme Soviet-U.S. Congress Telebridge Noted

LD1606123588 [Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 0330 GMT on 16 June broadcasts a 110-minute telebridge entitled "From Capital to Capital; USSR Supreme Soviet-U.S. Congress Telebridge," introduced by S.M. Plekhanov, deputy director of the USSR Institute of the United States and Canada.

The program opens with a video clip of a similar event 14 months ago in which members of the U.S. Congress and the USSR Supreme Soviet took part. Plekhanov is seen seated in a studio watching archive material on a television monitor of the previous event and proceeds to review previous telebridges which have taken place between the USSR and the United States, and the changing relationship between the two countries.

Plekhanov says: "The telebridges have become a new form of dialogue because one is dealing with people who play an enormous role in the elaboration of state policy—the USSR Supreme Soviet and the U.S. Congress. To a large extent, the fate of our two countries and the whole world depends on how the representatives of these bodies think, how they regard Soviet-U.S. relations, and how they are able to cooperate. It seems to me that there is every reason to consider that the telebridges between the legislators have made a serious contribution to establishing new Soviet-U.S. relations."

Plekhanov recalls that since the last telebridge, held in November last year, summits have been held in Washington and Moscow which made a start to nuclear disarmament and which removed many obstructions in Soviet-U.S. relations.

Plekhanov then introduces the two U.S. participants in the present telebridge. These are Speaker Jim Wright, a Democrat from Texas and third most influential person in the United States, and who last year headed a delegation of congressmen to Moscow for talks in the Supreme Soviet; and Senator Richard Lugar, an influential Republican congressman.

When Plekhanov concludes these introductory remarks, the video switches to show the audience and speakers on the Soviet side of the telebridge. The Soviet anchorman is Zolotarevskiy, who does not introduce his companions until later. They are Yevgeniy Maksimovich Primakov, academician director of the World Economics and International Relations Institute and deputy of the USSR Supreme Soviet; and Vadim Valentinovich Zagladin, first deputy chief of the CPSU Central Committee International Department and deputy of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

On the U.S. side, the discussion is chaired by Peter Jennings.

The body of the telebridge commences with Jennings noting the interest shown by many Americans in processes taking place in the USSR. He asks whether the upcoming party conference is a referendum on Gorbachev's policy and whether communism is the reason for many of the USSR's problems.

Zolotarevskiy elects Primakov to reply. Primakov says: "Indeed, this party conference will be devoted to questions of restructuring. We already have covered a path of 3 years, and we have to evaluate this properly. We have to take a look at what we have achieved and what we have not achieved as we have progressed along the path of restructuring, and the obstacles which we have to overcome. We also have to map out progress for the future. Evidently, radical proposals of some kind will be made, and so on. Judging by the discussion which is now under way in our press, such proposals of radical transformations in the political structure of the Soviet Union are being expressed.

"On your question about whether communism will be at the center of attention, then yes, of course: It is at the center of our life in general already. The whole of restructuring is based on the striving to purge socialism of all accretions. But the whole of restructuring does not go beyond the bounds of socialism. It is a quest for ways to improve and strengthen socialism. It is a quest for ways to advance in this sphere."

Lugar asks whether Stalin was inevitable and that the USSR unavoidably got Stalin. Zagladin replies:

"Mr Lugar, such a point of view has indeed been expressed in our country, but it is one of many representing an insignificant minority. History, in general, we feel, has many permutations [mnogovariantno]. We had many opportunities after the revolution and after the death of Lenin, and it was a fortuitous event that Stalin found himself in control. There were some objective reasons for this, but in principle this was not a foregone conclusion. History could have gone a different way. If we had continued what Lenin began, things would have been different. This is a problem which we are now discussing. The problem of the options is being discussed. A whole mass of personal views is being expressed. It is a very interesting discussion which is far from over. But the general view is that this was not an inevitability, but it became—unfortunately—a tragic reality. Our task now consists in, first of all removing everything negative created by Stalin and during this period in general, and second, to create a solid guarantee to ensure that such a possibility is not repeated. We are convinced that we shall achieve this."

Lugar then asks whether the Soviet side is prepared, in the sphere of power, to have a system of checks and balances where independent people are elected to electorial bodies and there is an independent court which counterbalances the decisions of the executive. This, he says, is the genius of the U.S. system of government.

Primakov replies: "There you go. You Americans always think that you have the monopoly in any sphere. You think that you are genial because you have invented a system which, generally speaking, is in the arsenals of many countries. We also have independent bodies; we also have an independent court; and if there is anything that is less than independent in this area, we will do everything to ensure that it becomes more independent under the conditions of restructuring. But for God's sake, don't think that this is—that, so to speak, you are giving the world some kind of model here. We are going our own way, and we, too, are arriving at our great values."

Lugar insists that under the U.S. Constitution and the multiparty system, governments can be changed. He asks how the Soviets can change a government if they don't like it.

Zagladin responds by saying: "Democratically, Mr Senator. But I want to return to what you were saying, and to say that there are some differences in views between myself and my friend Yevgeniy Primakov. For example, I feel that the court in our country is as yet insufficiently independent, and in this sense, I think that those proposals which are being made to ensure a truly independent court are very proper. We have our own system, of course, but we are now thinking about how to divide the powers and functions of the separate bodies, precisely in the interest of ensuring the rights of every citizen of our country.

"So far as a change in the leadership is concerned, then this is effected democratically in our country, but we will now vigorosly improve our system. We shall improve the electoral system in order to ensure a plurality of candidates and the possibility of a real choice. We will provide a new procedure for making decisions in order that decisions can be discussed in advance by the people and the voters—at local or state scale—to a much greater extent than was formerly the case. In other words, there are going to be a lot of changes in our country, but it is hard to say now what these will be. A mass of proposals have been made; the conference will discuss them, but it will not decide. I want to stress that this is a party conference. It can adopt recommendations of one kind or another, express hopes, but it is the USSR Supreme Soviet and its deputies which will decide, for example, questions on the state system. If necessary, we are ready to make amendments to our Constitution in order to ensure a more democratic, more open, if you want, procedure for the functioning of our system. That is my answer to your question."

During the ensuring discussion, the topic of noninterference in each other's affairs is raised in the human rights sphere. U.S. congressman raises the topic of continuing difficulties experienced by Jews seeking to emigrate, and others in political detention.

In his reply, Zagladin says: "You are saying that there are 350 people in detention. If one takes the individuals whom you consider to be political prisoners in our country, then there are 18 such people in our country in corrective labor camps and 11 in corrective camps. That is 28 people, not 350." He goes on to explain that a number of people are refused exit permits on the grounds of access to secret information only, and other reasons for refusing such permission have now been removed.

Much of the remaining discussion deals with exchanges on how the two countries can cooperate in the spheres of space research, environmental protection, and the peaceful use of nuclear energy.

There is also a brief discussion on regional conflicts, including Cambodia and the role of Pakistan's involvement in Afghanistan's problems.

Delegation in U.S. for Joint Peace March

LD1706103688 Moscow TASS in English 0936 GMT 17 Jun 88

[Text] Washington June 17 TASS—TASS special correspondent Maksim Knyazkov reports:

A plush doll-costume named Miryusha—a symbol of kindness, openness and hospitality—headed for several minutes Thursday a delegation of Soviet peace-minded public who arrived in Washington to take part in the

Soviet-American peace march. The delegation, accompanied by musicians who performed Russian and American folk melodies, was the first to walk down the tarmac to meet numerous U.S. anti-war activists who arrived at Dulles Airport to welcome their Soviet friends.

They are in for not an easy but interesting journey. The participants in the peace march will walk through Maryland, Pennsylvania, Iowa, California and other U.S. states, meet ordinary Americans, take part in discussions and concerts of amateur artists. Their objective is to get to know each other better and thus help promote mutual understanding between the Soviet and American peoples, peace and security on earth. On the Soviet delegation are 220 representatives of all union republics—workers, collective farmers, students and schoolchildren.

Delivering a welcoming address to the Soviet peace campaigners, Allan Affelt, president of the U.S. anti-war organisation, International Peace Walk, stressed that the starting march was an unprecedented event in the history of the American anti-war movement. The delegation of the Soviet peace-minded public, as mass as this one, visits the United States for the first time ever. It will pass shoulder-to-shoulder with Americans across the entire country.

In a certain sense, we are making history now, Affelt said. We hope that our actions to involve alongside Soviet people also at least 100 Americans will help further reduce world tensions and ameliorate Soviet-U.S. relations.

We are confident of the success of our march, Vladimir Fedosov, executive secretary of the Soviet Peace Committee, who heads the Soviet delegation, said in his reply remarks. A truly Soviet landing party touched down on U.S. territory today. But these are people's diplomats who are fully determined to work to improve relations between our two countries and the general climate in the world. Possibly, we will not agree with each other in everything during the debates, but there are no doubts that we will be univocal in what is all-important—the desire to preserve peace on earth.

China

Final Part of Titarenko Remarks on Reform

OW1606095488 Moscow Radio Peace and Progress in Mandarin to Asia-Pacific Region 1300-GMT 15 Jun 88

[Text] Dear listeners, for 2 consecutive days, we have broadcast a talk by Titarenko, director of the Far East Institute of the USSR Academy of Sciences, entitled: "The Common Points and Differences of Economic Reform in the Soviet Union and China." The first two parts of this talk discussed the common points and objectives of reform in the two countries. Today he will discuss the differences in reform in the two countries and how they can learn from each other in solving all kinds of problems. Please listen to the last part of Titarenko's talk:

Titarenko says: We and our Chinese comrades share many common points in reform of the planning process. For a long time in the past, the two countries practiced a unified planning system and managed enterprises by issuing administrative orders. Now both countries wish to change this planning process as quickly as possible.

Medium-sized and small enterprises in China have in fact already abandoned unified mandatory plans and begun to arrange production according to guidance plans, economic value, and market demand. In my opinion, the Chinese experience in establishing nationwide markets for means of production, negotiable securities, technology, and labor force is valuable to us.

According to some Chinese economists, they have made comparatively greater achievements by establishing markets for means of production. At present, some 50 percent of the means of production are supplied by such markets. For instance, they experimented with a means of production market in Shijiazhuang, a big city. During the experiment, the prices of means of production were completely decontrolled, and all means of production there were sold at market prices; enterprises that completed their production tasks according to mandatory plans sold their products and bought means of production at market prices in this market and were allowed to retain the surplus profits gained from the difference between government-set prices and market prices. This practice proved beneficial to both the state and the enterprises.

Let me repeat, this experience is very significant. In the course of economic reform, Chinese reformers have encountered a very complex question—the question of how to establish a new price structure. We too are faced with this complex problem. At present, we are still preparing to solve this problem while the Chinese have already entered the initial stage of solving it, encountering some complex problems in the process.

First, there are inflation-related problems—problems of how to compensate low-income workers for the higher prices and how to abolish the allowance system. Obviously, it is very difficult to solve this problem soon. The allowance system in China, like that in our country, involves many products and consumer items, such as food grain, meat, transport, housing, and medical care. Currently, the Chinese want to rely exclusively on the market in determining prices and are searching for the most rational ways through pilot projects. The Chinese comrades also want to know how we are going to abolish allowances and set commodity prices according to demand.

I believe that the Chinese have some useful experience and share some common points with us in developing economic cooperation and bringing into full play the workers' initiative in production. The Chinese realize that in this respect, they must overcome the idea of equalitarianism which still exists to a great extent in China. During our visit to suburban areas of Tianjin Municipality, Chinese comrades told us that they still could not decide to change the principle of equalitarianism in land distribution.

In China, some people envy others with higher income and don't realize that they are contributing less than others, and they always want to take advantage of the collective. In fact, such a phenomenon also exists in our country. Here is a common problem shared by the two countries, the problem of how to establish the socialist principle of to each according to his work.

Of course, there are many other areas in which the situation in China completely differs from ours. However, generally speaking, the orientation of reform in the Soviet Union is, by and large, the same as that in China, and this makes it necessary for our two countries to further expand their all-around cooperation and exchange their experience in reform with each other.

More on Liaoning Delegation's Visit to USSR

Received by Maslennikov

PM1606131388 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 8 Jun 88 First Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Developing Ties"]

[Text] We regard your arrival as confirmation of the positive changes that have taken place in Soviet-Chinese relations in recent years.

It was with those words that N.I. Maslennikov, deputy chairman of the RSFSR Council of Ministers, began a meeting on 7 June with a delegation from the PRC's Liaoning Province led by Zheng Silin, vice governor of the Provincial People's Government.

The conversation, which took place in a friendly atmosphere, was about expanding and improving economic and other forms of cooperation between RSFSR border krays and oblasts and Liaoning Province. It was noted that the two countries' developed national economy and rich natural resources open up great opportunities for this. In particular, the guests showed interest in Soviet tractors, rolled metal, petrochemical products, mineral fertilizers, and timber. They expressed their willingness to deliver, for example, pulp, watches, clothing, and fabrics.

The general opinion was expressed that the development of multifaceted Soviet-Chinese ties and contacts is helping to strengthen friendship between our peoples.

RSFSR Foreign Minister V.M. Vinogradov took part in the conversation.

Cooperation Document Signed

PM1606144388 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 9 Jun 88 Second Edition p 3

[TASS report: "Expanding Cooperation"]

[Text] A document on the results of the visit to the RSFSR by an economic delegation from Liaoning Province (PRC) was signed at the RSFSR Foreign Ministry on 8 May. The document states that there are great opportunities for developing economic, scientific, and technical cooperation between RSFSR krays, oblasts and enterprises and their counterparts in Liaoning Province. To these ends, the sides have agreed to promote commodity exchange deals, to investigate spheres where joint enterprises, including those in third countries, could be set up, to exchange export goods fairs, and to study the possibility of exchanging advanced technology in various spheres of industry and agriculture.

An agreement was reached to set up regular contacts between the RSFSR Foreign Ministry and the province's Foreign Affairs Office, the RSFSR Gosplan and the province's Planning and Economic Commission, and RSFSR trade and economic organizations, ministries, and local organs of power of the Far Eastern krays and oblasts and Liaoning Province foreign trade organizations.

The document was signed for the Soviet side by RSFSR Foreign Minister V.M. Vinogradov and for the Chinese side by Zheng Silin, delegation head and vice chairman of Liaoning Provincial People's Government.

On the same day, the delegation held conversations in the USSR Ministry of Foreign Economic Relations, the RSFSR Ministry of Culture, and the RSFSR Potrebsoyuz and visited the USSR Exhibition of National Economic Achievments.

After their stay in Moscow, the PRC guests visited Blagoveshchensk, Khabarovsk, and Chita before returning home.

Visit Khabarovsk

PM1606135588 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 14 Jun 88 Second Edition p 3

[TASS report: "Favorable Prospects"]

[Text] Khabarovsk, 13 Jun—A desire to actively cooperate with the USSR's Far East region has been expressed by the members of an economic delegation from China's Liaoning Province that is visiting here. It has held talks with representatives of local foreign trade organizations and familiarized itself with the export potential of Khabarovsk Kray and Amur Oblast.

"This is the first time that our province has sent such a representative delegation to the Soviet Union," the TASS correspondent was told by Zheng Silin, head of the delegation, vice governor of Liaoning Province, and chairman of the Provincial Committee for Foreign Relations. "We have made it our aim to determine the potential of cooperation—potential which we intend to develop in three directions. First, our country proposes organizing trade on barter principles. We could purchase timber, steel, and machine-building output from the USSR. In turn, we could supply light industry articles, electronic instruments, and agricultural produce. Second, the creation of Soviet-Chinese joint enterprises on Soviet territory could be to our mutual benefit. We believe that it is possible to organize a specialized farm to grow ginseng, and we are prepared to share the 'secrets' of traditional Chinese medicine and set up pharmaceutical enterprises using Soviet raw materials."

Many enterprises have shown interest in cooperation with the Soviet Union, Zheng Silin said.

'Satisfied' With Visit

OW1606131888 Moscow International Service in Mandarin 0100 GMT 15 Jun 88

[Text] The economic delegation from Liaoning Province, China, has ended its visit to the Soviet Union. The visit was made at the invitation of the RSFSR Foreign Ministry.

The delegation held talks with the Soviet side at the Chita Oblast Soviet Executive Committee. Both sides exchanged views on many issues concerning direct economic, trade, scientific, and technological cooperation between Liaoning and Chita Oblast.

Zheng Silin, head of the Chinese delegation and vice governor of the Liaoning Provincial People's Government, told a TASS reporter: We are satisfied with the outcome of our visit to the Soviet Far East. From our talks in Khabarovsk, Blagoveshchensk, and Chita, we discovered that there is great potential for developing mutually beneficial cooperation in all areas between the two sides.

Near East & South Asia

Rebel Activities in Afghan Provinces Reported

LD1606110188 Moscow TASS in English 1034 GMT 16 Jun 88

[Text] Kabul June 16 TASS—Seven civilians, including women and children, were killed in Kabul Wednesday evening when residential areas in the Afghan capital came under a rocket attack by extremists.

Thirteen other Kabul inhabitants were wounded in the attack which destroyed several houses.

The situation in the southern Afghan province of Qandahar remains tense. A group of terrorists has been arrested in its capital after making its way there to commit murders and acts of sabotage. The ten terrorists, all members of the extremist "Islamic Party of Afghanistan," were captured by security forces with active assistance from local people. They were turned over to judicial authorities.

Operations are continuing in Spin Buldak District bordering on Pakistan to liberate a number of populated localities there from die-hard opposition groups. Afghan Army units yesterday overran several rebel strongholds, routing the armed groups defending them. BAKHTAR News Agency reported.

A 200-strong opposition group in the northern province of Fariab has renounced armed struggle against the government. Their 300 of so family members returned to native villages together with them.

Persons convicted for anti-state activities are continuing to be released in keeping with a general amnesty which has been declared in a presidential decree adopted right after the proclamation of the policy of national reconciliation. Another 25 convicts were set free from Kabul's Puli Charhi prison Wednesday.

Afghan refugees are returning home in large numbers from Iran and Pakistan. In the past two days 550 of them came back to Herat and Farah provinces through the border point Eslam Qal'eh. Another 60 returnees were received in the eastern province of Laghman.

Clan chiefs and elders from the Pashtun tribes of Mangal, Jaji, Gardizi, Ahmedzai, Jadran, Tutihayl, Zombat and Chamkani, meeting in the city of Gardeyz, have established a standing Jirgah (council) of Paktia Province.

The council, elected at the meeting, said it will concentrate on restoring peace throughout the province. The Pashtuns adopted an appeal to the leaders of opposition groups operating in Paktia and to people from that province now living in Pakistan to return to peaceful work in their home parts.

The tribal chiefs and elders unanimously supported the Geneva agreements on Afghanistan, stressing the need for all sides involved in the conflict to fulfil them without fail.

The leader of "the National Islamic Front of Afghanistan," which is part of "the Alliance of the Seven," Sayyed Ahmad Gaylani, has, according to reports reaching here, replaced Gulbuddin Hikmatyar, head of the counter-revolutionary "Islamic Party of Afghanistan," as the alliance leader.

Troops Reportedly Deployed Near Pakistan Border

OW1706123788 Beijing Domestic Service in Mandarin 0930 GMT 17 Jun 88

[Text] According to Dong Runfang, a reporter of this station in Islamabad, pro-Afghanistan Soviet forces have deployed more troops in Waghjan, a border city near Northwest Pakistan, and have declared the area an off-limits zone.

According to reports, the USSR has deployed the latest type of long-range missiles in Waghjan. The Soviet defense minister made a 2-day visit to Waghjan early this month, and Soviet troops have carried out mammoth military exercises in Waghjan during the last 2 weeks.

Afghan Government Wins Vote of Confidence

LD1606203388 Moscow TASS in English 1833 GMT 16 Jun 88

[Text] Kabul June 16 TASS—The new Afghan Government of Prime Minister M.H. Sharq won a vote of confidence in the National Council (parliament) after six days of debates there, BAKHTAR News Agency reported.

All the members of the Wolasi Jirgah, the lower chamber, supported the newly-formed government and approved its planned home and foreign policies.

Wolasi Jirgah Chairman K.A. 'Abawi, speaking on behalf of all the chamber's members, congratulated the government and wished it success with efforts to achieve peace in Afghanistan.

Sharq in reply thanked the MP's for the trust in the government and assured them that it would attempt to achieve national reconciliation as soon as possible.

The participants in the session then adopted an appeal to the people of Afghanistan.

Soviet Red Cross Appeal on POW's in Pakistan

LD1706093088 Moscow TASS in English 0837 GMT 17 Jun 88

[Text] Moscow June 17 TASS—The Soviet Red Cross appealed to all people with information on the fate of Soviet servicemen who went missing on the territory of Afghanistan to respond and send any available information to the following address: USSR, Moscow, the Soviet Red Cross.

This request is contained in an appeal to the world public, published today, by the Union of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies of the USSR.

The appeal runs, in particular: "The undeclared war against the Republic of Afghanistan left many bleeding wounds on the body of this much-suffering land. There were killed, wounded and missing, including from among the Soviet servicemen of the territory of Afghanistan. The fate of Soviet soldiers who went missing concerns not only their kith and kin but every Soviet citizen as well. The Soviet Red Cross has constantly engaged in a search and assistance to them, but, unfortunately, little has been accomplished over these years.

"Additional possibilities for searching, rendering necessary assistance and bringing home Soviet servicemen, who went missing or fell into the hands of Afghan opposition, appeared today following the signing of the Geneva accords on the political settlement around Afghanistan, the start of the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Afghan territory and in conditions of active national reconciliation policy pursued by the Afghan Government."

Asking people in different countries for information about Soviet POWs, the Soviet Red Cross thanks in advance all those who will respond to this appeal.

Officials Meet New York Group

LD1606211588 Moscow TASS in English 1956 GMT 16 Jun 88

[Text] New York June 16 TASS—Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Vladimir Petrovskiy and Deputy Defence Minister, Army General Vitaliy Shabanov, met here with representatives of a private organisation, called "The International Committee for Saving Russian Prisoners of War in Afghanistan." The organisation is working for the release of over 300 Soviet servicemen taken prisoner in Afghanistan and now held in Pakistani territory.

At a press conference at the U.N. headquarters today Vladimir Petrovskiy said that the USSR regards the establishment of the committee as a humanitarian act pursuing an important goal. The Soviet Government will do everything to help it in its work.

Zaykov Receives Kabul PDPA Officials 16 Jun

LD1606105388 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1000 GMT 16 Jun 88

[Text] A meeting between Comrade Zaykov, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, first secretary of the Moscow Gorkom, and Comrade Razmyar, secretary of the PDPA Central Committee, secretary of the Kabul City Party Committee, and other members of the Afghan capital's delegation took place in Moscow today.

It was emphasized that the friendship and cooperation between the USSR and the Republic of Afghanistan and between both capitals will continue to gain in strength. The Geneva agreements open up a path toward a peaceful settlement of the situation surrounding Afghanistan and faciliate a strengthening of international security. Questions of developing further the ties between the two capitals were examined.

Pakistan Leader Enacts Shari'a as Supreme Law

LD1606132188 Moscow TASS in English 1309 GMT 16 Jun 88

[Text] New Delhi June 16 TASS—Pakistani President Ziaul Haq declared a decree on enactment of the Shari'a as the country's supreme law. Speaking on national radio and television, the president said that committees which would draft recommendations on streamlining the Pakistani economy and the educational system in compliance with the Shari'a, would be set up in one month's time.

Local analysts point out that under the present domestic conditions in Pakistan Ziaul Haq's decision is clearly spearheaded against democratic forces of the country and is aimed at consolidating even more his personal power.

Dobrynin Receives Algieria's Defense Official

LD1606175988 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1723 GMT 16 Jun 88

[Text] Moscow, 16 Jun (TASS)—Anatoliy Dobrynin, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, today met with Abdallah Belhouchet, member of the Algerian National Liberation Front [FLN] Politburo, deputy minister of national defense and chief of staff of the Algerian National People's Army. [Algiers APS in Arabic at 0910 GMT on 16 June reports that Abdallah Belhouchet arrived in Moscow on 15 June and was met by Sergey Akhromeyev, USSR first deputy defense minister and chief of the Soviet Armed Forces General Staff, adding: "It is noteworthy that this visit comes at the invitation of the Soviet side."]

During the conversation, mutual satisfaction was expressed at the high level of Soviet-Algerian relations. There was a thorough exchange of views on topical problems of the international situation, the position in the Near East and Middle East, and in the Arab Maghreb, which showed that the attitudes of the sides on these matters still coincide or are close. Note was taken of the importance and fruitful nature of interaction between the USSR and Algeria, the CPSU and the FLN for ensuring the effectiveness of efforts directed at maintaining peace, disarmament, and a political solution of global and regional problems.

Petrovskiy Meets With Egypt's 'Abd al-Majid

LD1606110088 Moscow TASS in English 0625 GMT 16 Jun 88

[Text] New York June 16 TASS—Vladimir Petrovskiy, deputy foreign minister of the USSR, on Wednesday met Ahmad 'Ismat 'Abd al-Majid, deputy prime minister and foreign minister of the Arab Republic of Egypt.

During the talk they discussed the issues related to the proceedings of the U.N. General Assembly's third special session on disarmament, prospects for a Middle East settlement and bilateral relations.

Both sides expressed satisfaction with the positive results of 'Abd al-Majid's recent visit to the USSR and confirmed the intention to build up a constructive potential of the two countries' cooperation in a variety of areas.

Sytenko Briefs Iraqi President on Summit

LD1506124288 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0720 GMT 15 Jun 88

[Text] Baghdad, 15 Jun (TASS)—Saddam Husayn, president of Iraq, has received M.D. Sytenko, special representative of the Soviet leadership and ambassador at large who has arrived in Baghdad to provide information on the results of the Moscow meeting between M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and U.S. President R. Reagan.

During their friendly conversation, the president spoke highly of the Moscow meeting, stressing that the entire world, including Iraq, welcomes the results of the meeting and views it as a major contribution to the cause of strengthening international security and averting a worldwide thermonuclear catastrophe. The president singled out the fact that such a high level meeting had discussed in detail the problem of moving regional conflicts out of deadlock.

He dwelled in particular on the task of resolving the Near East conflict by means of holding a plenipotentiary and effective conference on the Near East with all interested parties, including the PLO—the sole legitimate representative of the Arab people of Palestine—taking part.

He also paid considerable attention to the need to stop the Iran-Iraq war on the basis of UN Security Council Resolution 598, calling for the appropriate sanctions against the side which fails to fulfill its demands. At the same time S. Husayn noted the desire of Iraq to have normal peaceful relations with Iran.

During the conversation certain aspects of Soviet-Iraqi relations were also discussed.

Present at the meeting with the president of Iraq was L.N. Jasim, acting foreign minister of Iraq and minister of culture and information.

Polyakov Briefs Libya's Jallud on Summit

LD1606210388 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1353 GMT 16 Jun 88

[Text] Tripoli, 16 Jun (TASS)—'Abd al-Salam Jallud, member of the Revolution Command Council of the Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriyah, today received V.P. Polyakov, a special representative of the Soviet leadership and a member of the Collegium of the USSR Foreign Ministry, who is here and who briefed him on the results of the Soviet-U.S. summit talks in Moscow.

'A.S. Jallud described the Moscow summit as a major political event and highly commended the efforts of the Soviet leadership and of M.S. Gorbachev personally to improve the international situation and uphold the new political thinking in world affairs. He declared that the Libyan leadership fully supports the Soviet initiatives directed toward disarmament and the prevention of nuclear war.

During the conversation there was a thorough exchange of views on a number of international issues, the Middle East situation, and aspects of bilateral relations. P.S. Akopov, USSR ambassador to the Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriyah, was present at the meeting.

Libya-Chad Reconciliation Moves Reported

PM1606135988 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 14 Jun 88 First Edition p 5

[Report by own correspondent S. Filatov: "New Situation"]

[Text] Algiers, 13 Jun—A qualitatively new situation is taking shape in relations between Libya and Chad—two African countries which have been enemies for a long time, an enmity that led to hostilities.

Some days ago leader of the Libyan revolution M. al-Qadhdhafi announced recognition of the H. Habre government that is in power in Ndjamena and a desire to settle all existing differences with it.

There has now been a reply from Ndjamena. In its statement the Council of Ministers stressed Chad's willingness to normalize relations between the neighboring countries and to hold a meeting between the heads of the two countries', although it did not mention the possibility of G. Oueddei's [president of opposition group Transitional National Union Government] participation in it. War is not in the interests of either the Chadian or the Libyan peoples, the statement says. Therefore, Chad is not opposed to participation in the process of restoring peace.

There was a positive assessment of the two countries' steps by OAU Chairman M. Traore, elected to that post in May by a routine OAU session. According to him, the opportunity to settle the problems must not be missed. The new situation obviously will also facilitate the work of the OAU special committee dealing with the settlement of the border conflict between Libya and Chad. The question of ownership of the disputed "Aozou Strip" can be solved by political means, the committee's representatives believe.

East Europe

Gorbachev To Visit Poland 10-20 Jul

LD1606133588 Moscow TASS in English 1328 GMT 16 Jun 88

[Text] Moscow June 16 TASS—Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, will pay an official friendly visit to the Polish People's Republic at the invitation of Wojciech Jaruzelski, first secretary of the Central Committee of the Polish United Workers' Party, and highest Polish state authorities in the period between July 10 and 20, 1988.

Pyadyshev Interviewed on Relations With Bulgaria

AU1606130988 Sofia TRUD in Bulgarian 15 May 88 p 3

[Interview with Boris Pyadyshev, editor in chief of MEZHDUNARODNAYA ZHIZN, by Georgi Naydenov, Moscow correspondent: "Is It Not a Paradox Today That We Are Still Unfamiliar With the Prospects for Our Fraternal Relations?"; date and place not given]

[Excerpts] [Passage omitted] [Naydenov] Boris Pyadyshev, my interviewee, is really well acquainted not only with Bulgarian journalists but also with the Bulgarian reading public. He is a doctor of historical sciences, who served at first as cultural attache and later as charge d'affaires of several Soviet ambassadors in our country. [passage omitted]

[Pyadyshev] I have been observing the work of the Warsaw Pact Foreign Ministers Committee for the last 10 years, beginning with the second session, which, I think, took place in 1977, in Sofia. As a member of the Soviet delegation, I attended the last meeting which also took place in the Boyana residence. I must say that I observed great progress both in the approach and in the atmosphere of the session. [passage omitted]

You know that after 40 years of economic cooperation, which has passed through several stages, we have accumulated a considerable amount of joint, historical experience. However, from the point of view of economic integration, we are now facing quite a complicated stage of development. Without trying to assess the state of CEMA cooperation and of relations between individual countries with negative or positive ratings, I cannot describe the state of these relations as totally satisfactory.

[Naydenov] This sphere also appears to have been affected by the "stagnating mechanism"?

[Pyadyshev] Yes, we have not yet fully understood the interests that should guide us in our work within the CEMA framework, the interests of each individual country, and of the socialist community as a whole. The same applies to the means and mechanism of satisfying these interests. In a speech delivered during his recent visit to

Budapest, Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov, our prime minister, stated that the structure and mechanism of CEMA seem to be reminiscent of the 19th century. [passage omitted]

[Naydenov] The recent Moscow summit meeting, along with specific topical issues, also dealt with questions pertaining to the future of mankind on a wider scale. After being aware to a great extent of the several most basic but specific problems for which we are now providing new solutions, such as the political settlement of local conflicts, sufficiency for defense, and the rights and obligations of the individual, do you not think that a more generalized view of relations between the two social systems is possible? Why should we, for example, leave to the West the opportunity of imposing its own "convergence," instead of launching our own positive initiative?

[Pyadyshev] Over many years, under Stalin, but even after him, our stand was determined by the very accurate but biting words in Aleksandr Tvardovskiy's poem: "Tyorkin in the Other World":

"There are two worlds and two systems, and the border is locked."

This stand that was adopted by Stalin is directly opposed to Lenin's approach regarding the question of the Soviet Union's place in the worldwide system of states. Unfortunately, Lenin's theoretical legacy on Soviet Russia's future policy is rather limited. He did not have time to complete it. However, if we carefully read and reflect on the essence of the thoughts he expressed toward the end of his life, we can understand perfectly that, according to his ideas, the Soviet Union's place is among the other countries in the mainstream of international affairs, not in isolation. Unfortunately, however, things changed when Stalin came to power. I am by no means saying that the "iron curtain" was our creation; it is a Western invention, but we also contributed our share to it.

[Naydenov] Perhaps, our attitude to this invention, which was preceded by the prewar "cordon sanitaire" was too passive? We denounced it, but did not break through it; we failed to destroy this psychological barrier.

[Pyadyshev] Yes, our attitude was passive indeed. However, radical changes are taking place today, and we hope that the more we advance, the more this process will be intensified. [passage omitted] I do not say that barriers should be totally eliminated. There is an ancient proverb saying that good fences make good neighbors. Fences are necessary, but we do not need high towers, guards, and barbed wire, just fences of reasonable sufficiency. Numerous questions connected with this issue are now being revised in our country, such as the question of travel and communications with other countries. Today we remember the jamming of Western radio broadcasts as something of the past.

In other words, our Soviet leadership has firmly embarked upon the path of democracy. Socialism without democracy is no socialism. It can be a totalitarian state, a half-totalitarian dictatorship, anything but socialism. Socialism will prosper only when it is combined with democracy. Stalin divided the two concepts when he proceeded against Lenin's cause. The present leadership, headed by Gorbachev, is precisely engaged in the process of combining socialism with democracy.

PRAVDA Reports Antonov Activities in Prague

PM1706084588 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 16 Jun 88 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Deepening Ties"]

[Text] Prague, 15 Jun—The 28th session of the intergovernmental Soviet-Czechoslovak Commission on Economic and Scientific and Technical Cooperation was held here 13-15 June. The Soviet delegation was headed by A.K. Antonov, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, and the Czechoslovak delegation by R. Rohlicek, first deputy premier of the CSSR Government.

The sides examined the progress in implementing the accords reached at the meeting between M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and M. Jakes, general secretary of the CPCZ Central Committee, in January 1988 and also during the talks between N.I. Ryzhkov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, and L. Strougal, premier of the CSSR Government.

The delegations discussed questions connected with the preparation of the concept of economic and scientific and technical cooperation between the USSR and the CSSR for 15-20 years, the start of the coordination of state plans for 1991-1995, the implementation on a bilateral basis of the comprehensive program for the CEMA countries' scientific and technical progress through the year 2000, the fulfillment of mutual commitments under agreements on cooperation in constructing integration projects on the territory of the USSR, and further work on improving the technical standard and quality of reciprocally delivered machine building output.

The session examined in detail the state and prospects of cooperation between the two countries' enterprises and organizations within the framework of new forms of economic collaboration and defined measures for its further improvement.

A protocol was signed on the results of the session.

L. Strougal received A.K. Antonov here today. During the talk there was an examination of a broad range of questions connected with preparation for the CEMA session and the meeting of the CSSR and USSR heads of government which will take place in early July this year in Prague.

During the discussion the premier of the CSSR Government noted that the implementation of the comprehensive program for the CEMA countries' scientific and technical progress through the year 2000 is proceeding too slowly. He voiced the conviction that the forthcoming CEMA session will make it possible to lend better specific form to the program for the division of labor and will promote the enhancement of the effectiveness of direct ties and other progressive forms of collaboration.

West Europe

Gromyko Meets With Finnish Ambassador 15 Jun

PM1606133188 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
16 Jun 88 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Reception of Ambassador"]

[Text] A.A. Gromyko received Heikki Talvitie, Finnish ambassador to the USSR, in the Kremlin 15 June at the latter's request.

During the friendly talk there was a discussion of the state and development prospects of Soviet-Finnish relations and several international issues.

A.A. Gromyko and H. Talvitie expressed satisfaction at the fact that Soviet-Finnish relations are developing steadily and progressively on the firm foundation of the 1948 Treaty on Friendship, Cooperation, and Mutual Aid. Both the Soviet Union and Finland, it was noted during the talk, have the firm intention of deepening their friendship, building up trust, and enriching collaboration between our countries on the basis of solicitous concern for each other's interests in equal partnership. It was emphasized that the meetings between M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and Finnish President Mauno Koivisto lend fresh impetus and new dynamism to the whole substantial volume of Soviet-Finnish communication.

We highly assess the stability of our relations, A.A. Gromyko said. The visits of eminent Finnish guests to the Soviet Union have laid many firm bricks in the edifice of Soviet-Finnish relations. Political relations are firm. As for economic or, as they are also called, business relations, in their magnitude and essence they can compete with the Soviet Union's similar links with any other country of the Western world. Soviet people know that the Finnish trademark is rated highly.

At the same time it is necessary not only to be able to preserve what has been achieved in the field of Soviet-Finnish economic cooperation but also to ensure reliable prospects for its development. We must be more vigorous than hitherto in seeking mutually advantageous decisions and introducing new forms of contacts and we must embark more effectively on the implementation of large-scale programs, of which the Kola project is an example.

In discussing international questions, A.A. Gromyko stressed that the aim of the Soviet Union's foreign policy is to build a nonnuclear, nonviolent world in which the very rich potential of equal cooperation between states and peoples can be fully realized. The positive trend in world politics is persistently blazing a trail. The definite improvement in Soviet-U.S. relations confirmed in the results of the recent Moscow summit instills hope of a fundamental shift toward nuclear disarmament and will undoubtedly promote the solution of other fundamental problems of the present day.

A.A. Gromyko and H. Talvitie expressed satisfaction at the proximity or coincidence of the positions of the Soviet Union and Finland on the most important international problems. In particular, there was talk of the creation of a nuclear-free zone in northern Europe, the building of an "all-European home," and of the positive influence of restructuring in the Soviet Union on the entire atmosphere of international communications.

The Finnish side noted that the present U.S. Administration's attitude toward the Soviet Union is changing. This was clearly manifested even during President Reagan's speeches in Helsinki before his visit to the Soviet Union, to which the ambassador himself was a witness.

There was also a discussion of the situation in and around Afghanistan. H. Talvitie noted that the mission of UN observers of the fulfillment of the Geneva accords is headed in Afghanistan by a Finnish general. A.A. Gromyko stated that there are instances, and there are many of them, of overt violations of the Geneva accords by Pakistan and hoped that the Finnish general will actively assist the observance of these agreements.

The interlocutors also discussed the United Nations' importance in the world today and concluded that in recent years it has been taking resolutions that meet with a broad response in the world.

In the first years after the creation of the United Nations, A.A. Gromyko said, it so happened that during voting at General Assembly sessions the Soviet Union has been in a minority but now only two hands—those of Israel and the United States—are raised against decisions made at the sessions. So the changes are extremely tangible.

USSR Deputy Foreign Minister Yu.M. Vorontsov, Pekka Ojanen, adviser and envoy at the Finnish Embassy, and Jouko Alaluusua, trade adviser at the same embassy, took part in the talk.

TASS Cites French Expert on Election Results

LD1606205488 Moscow TASS in English 1842 GMT 16 Jun 88

[Text] Paris June 16 TASS—By TASS correspondent Nikita Yermakov:

One of the main distinctive features of the early elections to the National Assembly, which were held in France on June 5 and 12, has been the record large number of people who did not come to the polls, a TASS correspondent was told by Philippe Mechet, deputy director of Sofres, the biggest French institution for the study of public opinion. In his view, this is explained in a considerable measure by the loss of trust of the Frenchmen in political figures, reluctance to choose between similar programmes and their being sick and tired of frequent elections.

At the same time the new composition of the lower chamber of the French Parliament, in which not a single political group has won an absolute majority for the first time in 30 years, reflects a considerable change in the mood of the electorate, he continued. Despite the frequent change of the ruling force over the past decade, the population can see that the change in the speeches of the politicians does not lead to a change in the living standards.

Speaking then on the returns of voting for various parties, the Sofres deputy director stressed that many left electors have not supported the wish of the socialists for broadening the political base of their parliamentary majority, above all at the expense of the centrists. Therefore, although the Socialist Party has increased its representation in the National Assembly by sixty seats and has won a relative majority, this cannot be described as its full victory. On the contrary, the Communist Party has been indisputable success [as received], despite the majority system of voting disadvantageous to it. The Communists have reaffirmed the strength of their positions in the provinces. Albeit formally the left-wing forces—the Communists and socialists—have an absolute majority now, their alliance in the government and Parliament is politically impossible, he noted. In his words, to form a stable majority a search is possible for a form of an alliance between the French Socialist Party and the Centrists.

The situation in the right-wing camp is simple neither, Phillippe Mechet went on to say. The coalition of the moderate right-wingers has made it possible for them to evade a crushing defeat at the elections, yet there has been a certain division in that bloc. Thus, the neo-Gaulist Rassemblement Pour la Republique (RPR) has lost its leading positions in the right-wing camp which has been captured by its partners from the bloc Union Pour la Democratic Francaise (UDF) in their turn at the expense of the liberals. All that has complicated the situation among the right-wingers, where the difficult processes of division are now taking place. At last, the ultra-rightist "National Front" has suffered a major defeat and could only with difficulty preserve one seat.

French Communist Comments

PM1606120188 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 16 Jun 88 Second Edition p 5

[Dispatch by own correspondent V. Bolshakov: "Greeting Festival"]

[Text] Paris, 15 Jun—The French Communist press and above all L'HUMANITE, HUMANITE-DIMANCHE, LA MARSEILLAISE, and other French Communist Party [PCF] newspapers and journals have only just summed up one of the longest election campaigns in French history. "We have also made our contribution," L'HUMANITE's director, PCF Politburo member R. Leroy, said to journalists at the L'HUMANITE editorial office, "to the fact that the Communists have put to shame those who predicted a defeat for them at the elections." The Communists achieved the election of 27 deputies to the National Assembly (under the former proportional system they would have had about 70 deputies with those indicators). "We look to the future with confidence," R. Leroy said. "And L'HUMANITE's traditional festival on 10-11 September will be yet further proof of that."

The festival will take place under the sign of the 200th anniversary of the great French revolution.

Commentator Views Italian Premier's U.S. Visit

LD1606083088 Moscow International Service in Italian 1700 GMT 15 Jun 88

[Announcer-read report by station correspondent Vladimir Gerasichev from Washington]

[Text] Italian Prime Minister Ciriaco de Mita is continuing his visit to Washington. Vladimir Gerasichev reports from the United States:

The White House sees the Italian prime minister's visit and the negotiation he will conduct in Washington as an opportunity to further extend military cooperation between Italy and the United States and to increase NATO's bellicose potential. It must be said that these are not groundless expectations. Ciriaco de Mita took up the position of prime minister only 3 months ago, and in this period of time, as THE WASHINGTON POST noted, he has already done a great deal to consolidate Italy's links with its allies.

The Italian prime minister personally approved of the policy of military cooperation with the FRG. He is also planning a similar line with France, but oddly enough he is supporting the U.S. military effort. The U.S. press notes De Mita's personal worth in Italy's decision to house 72 U.S. F-16 fighter-bombers. It seems that the Italian prime minister does not see anything strange in

the fact that while renouncing cruise missiles, which are to be destroyed in accordance with the Soviet-U.S. agreement, Italy is preparing to receive new U.S. nuclear weapons that are being imposed on the country behind the Italian Parliament's back.

To what extent does all of this correspond to Europe's security interests and to the new international atmosphere resulting from the Soviet-U.S. meetings? To judge by the U.S. press' reactions to De Mita's visit, Gerasichev writes, not much thought has been given to this problem.

Under pressure from the White House, Italy is becoming more and more of a U.S. stronghold.

FRG Minister Urges Easing Cocom Restrictions

PM1706081988 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 9 Jun 88 Second Edition p 3

[TASS report: "In Favor of Abolishing Restrictions"]

[Text] FRG Foreign Minister H.-D. Genscher has advocated in parliament, the FRANKFURTER ALLGEMEINE reports, revising the "Cocom lists" and reducing barriers impeding the development of Soviet-West German economic ties. He stressed that existing restrictions bear the hallmark of the "thinking of the past."

In the opinion of K. Richter, president of the Federal Association of German Foreign Trade, the "Cocom lists" are a serious hindrance to many West German firms' export activity. Prominent economics expert K. Jacobsen [name as published] has pointed out that the toughened control, on U.S. initiative, over the supply of goods to socialist countries goes considerably beyond Western states' security requirements.

In advocating the development of trade and economic cooperation with the USSR West German business circles are pinning great hopes on restructuring.

Two Economic Contracts Signed With Turkey

PM1606153188 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 11 Jun 88 Morning Edition p 5

[Unattributed report under general heading: "Official Reports"]

[Text] Two contracts were signed 9 June at the USSR Ministry of Foreign Economic Relations between the All-Union "Soyuzvneshstroyimport" Association and the Turkish "ENKA" firm to build a 1,000-bed hospital for Great Patriotic War veterans and to restore and modernize the Petrovskiy Passazh building in Moscow.

Present at the signing of the contracts were K.F. Katushev, USSR minister of foreign economic relations, Ye.I. Chazov, USSR health minister, and O. Cankardes, Turkish ambassador to the Soviet Union.

Supreme Soviet Greets British Queen on Birthday

PM1606153388 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 11 Jun 88 Morning Edition p 2

[Supreme Soviet Presidium message to British Queen Elizabeth]

[Text] To Her Royal Highness Elizabeth II, Queen of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

On this British national holiday, your birthday, please accept our congratulations and very best wishes to the British people and to you personally.

USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium

Latin America & Caribbean

Dobrynin at Meeting in Memory of Che Guevara

PM1606131188 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 15 Jun 88 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report: "In Memory of Che Guevara"]

[Text] Soviet people honor the memory of Ernesto Che Guevara—a staunch Communist and passionate fighter against any oppression and for peace, democracy, and socialism. This was evidenced by the ceremonial meeting of representatives of Moscow's working people held 14 June. On this day Che, an ardent revolutionary internationalist and a legend in his own lifetime, would have been 60. His life was a flash of lightning that lit up the hearts of millions of people with the pure light of revolution. And as long as violence, exploitation, suffering, and injustice exist in the world, Che Guevara's impassioned call to struggle will ring out as a terrible warning over the world.

The meeting presidium included A.F. Dobrynin, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, leaders of a number of ministries and departments, and representatives of party, soviet, and public organizations. Also attending were J. Camacho, Cuban ambassador to the USSR, and a delegation from the Cuban Institute of the Friendship of the Peoples and the Cuban-Soviet Friendship Association headed by S. Vilaseca, rector of Cuba's International Relations Institute.

Pilot-Cosmonaut of the USSR V.A. Shatalov, president of the Soviet-Cuban Friendship Society, and other speakers talked about the glorious and dramatically vital path of the hero and the outstanding role he had played in the national-liberation movement in Cuba, in asserting and defending revolutionary ideals, and in building a socialist state on the Island of Freedom.

Che Guevara applied his knowledge and experience, the meeting participants noted, with equal enthusiasm and success in key areas of the formation of the young republic. His selfless devotion is an example to present generations.

Cubans remember Che Guevara as a talented military leader, a highly cultured person, and a humanist selflessly devoted to the ideals of freedom and social justice, J. Camacho said in his speech. He stressed the topicality of Che's theoretical legacy and his ideas on fostering a conscientious attitude to labor, working with cadres, overcoming mistakes in the way of socialist construction, and ensuring cleansing criticism in improving the new society.

Nicaraguan Contras Seek Further U.S. Aid

OW1706043588 Moscow Television Service in Russian 2320 GMT 15 Jun 88

[From the "Novosti" newscast; Aleksandr Serikov commentary]

[Text] Contra leaders have held a number of meetings with representatives of the U.S. Administration in Washington. Here now is our commentary:

[Serikov] Hello, comrades. After the contra leaders put an end to the peace talks with the Nicaraguan Government in Managua, and the military opposition leader—the infamous Bermudez—declared that the only way to talk with the Sandinists is with machinegun fire, after all this, the meeting of the contra leaders with their American bosses is a natural event. All is going according to a plan that was not altogether worked out by the contras themselves. When talks on ending the hostilities began—and the fighting really did stop—it appeared that perhaps some hope that the government and the opposition would reach an agreement really did exist. President Ortega even called the stand, adopted by contra leaders who came to the talks, patriotic.

The contras' period of independence was short-lived, however. They were told unambiguously what to do, after which they delivered an ultimatum demanding that the Nicaraguan Government renounce all the revolutionary gains, and then walked out of the peaceful talks, which were so difficult to organize in the first place.

What can the contra leaders hope for now? News from Washington indicates that the White House is pleased by their behavior. Secretary Shultz, who received their delegation, expressed his admiration and firm support for them. But mere words are not enough. Money is needed for weapons and armaments, so that talks with the Sandinists can be carried out in the language of machinegun fire. But up till now, even this form of aid has not been forthcoming.

Robert Michael, the House majority leader said, after meeting the President, that it was too early to speak of a vote on congressional aid to the contras, and that preliminary investigations would be necessary. House Speaker Jim Wright was even more categorical. He said straight out that the White House must not take advantage of a breakdown in the peace talks as cause for resuming military aid to the contras. The recent armistice is preferable to the bloodbath of recent years. There is profound thought to be found in these words. These thoughts are shared both by the Sandinists and the Nicaraguan people as a whole.

Political & Social

Tretyakov Replaced as Sakhalin Party Leader

LD1706112788 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1100 GMT 17 Jun 88

[Text] A plenum of the Sakhalin CPSU Obkom today discussed an organizational matter. Comrade Tretyakov has been released from duties as first secretary of the obkom in connection with his retirement on pension. Comrade Bondarchuk, who has previously worked as the deputy chief of a subdepartment of the CPSU Central Committee organizational party work department, was elected as first secretary of the Sakhalin party obkom.

Taking part in the work of the plenum was Mogilnichenko, deputy chief of the CPSU Central Committee Organizational Party Work Department.

Sverdlovsk First Secretary Petrov Replaced

LD1606211488 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1100 GMT 16 Jun 88

[Text] At a plenum of the Sverdlovsk Obkom today participants examined an organizational matter. In connection with his transfer to diplomatic work, Comrade Petrov was relieved of his duties as first secretary of the party obkom. Comrade Bobykin, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee, was elected first secretary of the obkom. He has been working as head of the Light Industry and Consumer Goods Department of the CPSU Central Committee and earlier was second secretary of the Sverdlovsk party obkom.

Gorkiy Obkom First Secretary Replaced

LD1606163988 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 16 Jun 88

[Text] The Gorkiy Obkom held a plenary session today to consider an organizational matter.

The plenum relieved Comrade Khristoradnov of his duties as first secretary of the CPSU Obkom in connection with his election as chairman of the Soviet of the Union of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

Comrade (Khodyrev), who was second secretary of the CPSU Obkom, has been elected first secretary of the Gorkiy party obkom.

Further Reportage on Armenia, Azerbaijan Events

Vezirov Addresses Intelligentsia

PM1606143788 Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian 15 Jun 88 p 7

[Own correspondent E. Agayev report under general heading "LITERATURNAYA GAZETA Reports"]

[Text] Baku—The intelligentsia is the real force of restructuring—this idea ran through the meeting between A.Kh. Vezirov, first secretary of the Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee, and representatives of the creative intelligentsia, held in the Azerbaijan Writers Union.

"We have found ourselves in a crisis situation"—these were the hard words, spoken with utmost frankness, that marked the beginning of the meeting. "We have let so much slip by! So here I am, to consult you—what are we to do? Where do we begin? What should we struggle for above all else? Why are we in such a situation?"

The principled heart-to-heart conversation which ensued touched upon the most diverse problems which the republic now faces. And the first point, the one to begin with, is to achieve a real and practical solution to the problem of Nagorno-Karabakh, as the well-known CPSU Central Committee and USSR Council of Ministers resolution requires. Many problems have accumulated in the republic. And they concern the economy, ecology, morals, work with youth, and culture.

An important role in the solution of these problems has to be played by the creative unions, there is need for coordination of their activity and close businesslike collaboration. In order to assist in this work, it was decided to open a Creative Unions House (Intelligentsia House) in an old mansion, an architectural monument in one of Baku's central streets. The future occupants have now embarked on restoring and furnishing their joint home on a shared basis.

Republics' Rayons' Joint Work

NC1706112088 Baku Domestic Service in Azeri 0340 GMT 15 Jun 88

[From the republican press review]

[Text] The Azerbaijan SSR's Kazakh Rayon, the Armenian SSR's (?Edzhevan) and Noyemberyanskiy Rayons, and the Georgian SSR's Marneulskiy Rayon have been realizing joint measures to consolidate international training for some time now. The favorable results of these measures have been explained in detail by Murad Ashirov, first secretary of the Kazakh Raykom, in BAKINSKIY RABOCHIY.

Vezirov Meets Muslim Leader

NC1706074388 Baku Domestic Service in Azeri 1600 GMT 15 Jun 88

[Text] Abdul-Rakhman Vezirov, first secretary of the Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee, received Sheykh ol-Eslam Allashukur Pasha-Zade, chairman of the Muslim Board of the Transcaucasus, on 15 June. The meeting was at the request of Pasha-Zade. It was noted during their talks that the workers in Azerbaijan, including the devout Muslims who are an inseparable part of the republic's people, warmly welcome and approve the reconstruction and democratization process and the idea of openness. It is the duty of the great masses of the republic to contribute toward the successful improvement of all areas of life. In view of the difficult times in the country, it is more necessary than ever before to inspire the people with best intentions, which conform to the tasks of the Soviet people.

A discussion was also held on the question of Nagorno-Karabakh and the developments around it. In this regard, the two officials noted the great importance of the decision adopted by the CPSU Central Committee and the USSR Council of Ministers in connection with the measures required for upgrading the pace of social and economic development in the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast from 1988 to 1995 and the steps taken by the Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee and the Azerbaijan SSR Council of Ministers. The objective of the measures is to expedite the strengthening of the productive forces in Nagorno-Karabakh and create favorable conditions for resolving social and cultural problems.

It was noted that the peoples of our multinational country are moving in the same direction. The objective is coexistence. The target is common prosperity within the united Soviet family, based on mutual confidence and fraternal relations. At the present time it is essential to act with caution, wisdom, and patience, and refrain from being carried away by emotion.

Vezirov congratulated Pasha-Zade on the occasion of his recent election to the steering council of the World Muslim Congress in Karachi, Pakistan, and wished him success in his noble and (?peace-loving) task.

For his part, Sheykh ol-Eslam Pasha-Zade said that the Muslims regard the Soviet conceptions of peace, prosperity, and well-being as sacred, applaud and approve the policy pursued by the state, and try to make a genuine contribution toward the reconstruction process. He also asserted that the Muslims have vested hope in the republic's new leadership and approve its work.

Pasha-Zade explained his views on the participation of Muslims in the celebrations held to mark the millennial anniversary of Christianity in Russia. He said: This festive occasion, which was marked in an atmosphere of brotherhood and solidarity among the representatives of various religions, has contributed toward the joint effort that is made for a better future for the beloved homeland.

The officials also discussed a number of other matters related to the continuation of the effective realization of [word indistinct] and religious freedom based on maintaining democratic principles in society.

Abdullayev, who is the representative of the USSR Council of Ministers Religious Affairs Department, participated in the meeting.

Muslim Leader Cited

LD1606131088 Moscow TASS in English 1030 GMT 16 Jun 88

[Text] Baku June 16 TASS—Muslims of Transcaucasia welcome and support the policy of the Soviet state and seek to make a real contribution to the cause of perestroyka in the country, the head of Transcaucasian Muslims said.

Sheykh ol-Eslam Allashukur Pasha-Zade, chairman of the Muslim Religious Board for Transcaucasia, was received Wednesday at his request by Abdul-Rakhman Vezirov, the newly-elected first secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Azerbaijan.

The Muslim leader said that the development of democratisation and glasnost in the USSR met with profound support of believers in the region.

"Soviet nations have only one road to follow—that of jointly building their prosperity in the conditions of mutual trust and brotherhood," Pasha-Zade said.

Vezirov congratulated the Sheykh-ol-Eslam on his recent election in Karachi, Pakistan, to the steering council of the World Muslim Congress and wished him success in his noble peace-making activities.

Armenian Parliament Session

LD1606231788 Yerevan International Service in Armenian 2030 GMT 16 Jun 88

[Text] The 7th Session of the 11th Convocation of the Armenian Supreme Soviet was held at the Stepan Shaumyan Palace yesterday. The session was chaired by Samson Tohoyan. Those attending the session observed a minute's silence to honor the memory of those who fell at Sumgait.

Having made a thorough study of the decision of the extraordinary session of the Soviet of the People's Deputies of Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast of the Azerbaijan Republic; taking into account the tense situation in Nagorno-Karabakh and around it as well as the expression of the will of the overwhelming majority of the Armenian population of Nagorno-Karabakh and Armenia; guided by Article 70 of the USSR Constitution on the right of the free self-determination of nations; the session agreed to the transfer of Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast to the Armenian Republic.

The session also decided to apply to the USSR Supreme Soviet to discuss and positively settle the question of the transfer of the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast from the Azerbaijan Republic to the Armenian Republic.

Appealing to the Azerbaijan Supreme Soviet, the Armenian Supreme Soviet expresses the hope that such a decision will not harm the traditional good-neighborly relations between the two republics and that it will be accepted with understanding by the Azerbaijani people.

The Supreme Soviet also unanimously passed a resolution to condemn the crimes committed against the Armenian population of Sumgait on 28 February 1988, expressing profound condolences to the families and relatives of the victims and expressing sympathy to those who suffered losses.

With a view to activating the institutions of our political system, to discover and choose the best means of harmonizing interethnic interests, for the internationalist education of the working people of all nationalities living in the Armenian Republic, and to create for them real prospects of expressing their needs and satisfying them, as well as to deepen their friendship and fraternity, a permanent commission of the Armenian Supreme Soviet on questions of interethnic relations and the internationalist education of the working people was set up.

Eduard Mirzoyan, chairman of the Administration of the Armenian Composers' Union, was elected chairman of the new commission which will have 15 members.

Azerbaijan Rejects Transfer

AU1706133188 Paris AFP in English 1328 GMT 17 Jun 88

[Text] Moscow, June 17 (AFP)—The Supreme Soviet, or parliament, in the southern republic of Azerbaijan Friday voted unanimously against the transfer of the Azerbaijani region of Nagorno-Karabakh to Armenia, official sources in Baku told AFP.

The Azerbaijani deputies voted at 1100 GMT in an afternoon session, two days after the Armenian parliament approved Armenian demands to transfer the Armenian-dominated enclave to Armenia.

Azerbaijani deputies said that the Armenian call for the territorial change was an "interference" in Azerbaijani affairs, an official from the republic's foreign ministry said. Deputies from Nagorno-Karabakh boycotted the session.

The negative vote had been widely expected and confirmed a decision last Monday by the republic's Supreme Soviet Presidium, the top state authority.

TASS Reports Rejection

LD1706151488 Moscow TASS in English 1504 GMT 17 Jun 88

[Text] Baku June 17 TASS—A session of Azerbaijan Supreme Soviet (Parliament) here today endorsed a decree of its Presidium on the unacceptability of the transfer of the Nagorno-Karabakh autonomous region from the Azerbaijan Republic to the Armenian Republic.

Arutyunyan 1 Jun Yerevan Address Described

PM1606125988 Yerevan KOMMUNIST in Russian 2 Jun 88 p 1

[ARMENPRESS "Report"]

[Text] A large rally was held 1 June in Yerevan. Comrade S.G. Arutyunyan, first secretary of the Armenian Communist Party Central Committee, spoke at it.

The rally discussed the primary tasks facing the republic on the eve of a most important event in the life of the party—the 19th all-union party conference. The speaker pointed out that many unsolved problems have accumulated in the republic's economy and in the social, ideological, and moral spheres and are evoking just discontent among working people. These problems can only be successfully resolved with the most active support of working people and the entire people. The main thing now, Comrade S.G. Arutyunyan said, is to normalize the situation in the republic, prevent thoughtless actions, and support the party course of restructuring and renewal not in words but in deeds. Wisdom, prudence, and restraint were always characteristic of our people. So let us once again display these noble qualities at this crucial period.

The speaker recalled that a Politburo decision tasked the CPSU Central Committee Secretariat with organizing a profound and comprehensive study of the problems that have built up in Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast and the reasons for the exacerbation of interethnic relations around it, working out appropriate proposals, and, when these were ready, submitting them for examination to the CPSU Central Committee and the SSR Government.

The CPSU Central Committee and the Soviet Government are paying tremendous attention to the problems of Nagorno-Karabakh and the requirements of the oblast. This is confirmed by the CPSU Central Committee and USSR Council of Ministers resolution to accelerate the socioeconomic development of Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast.

After condemning the tragic events in Sumgait, the first secretary of the Central Committee talked about the measures which are being taken to resolve questions linked with finding accommodation and jobs for Armenians arriving from Sumgait and also about the decision adopted to enrol students who have resettled from the Azerbaijan SSR in the appropriate faculties at the republic's VUZ's.

Comrade S.G. Arutyunyan described the meeting held recently with Comrade A.Kh. Vezirov, first secretary of the Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee.

Answers were also given at the rally to numerous questions put by participants.

Armenian Supreme Soviet Session Viewed

PM1606171588 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 17 Jun 88 Morning Edition p 2

[Special correspondents S. Bablumyan and Ye. Vostrukhov report under rubric "Union Republic Supreme Soviet Sessions": "Armenian SSR"]

[Text] Yerevan—The days and even weeks preceding the current session of the Armenian Supreme Soviet proved again very difficult for the republic. Yerevan and other

cities witnessed rallies and demonstrations attended by thousands of people. Meetings between Supreme Soviet deputies and voters were held everywhere. They were not formal meetings, for appearances sake, but meetings held at the request of the voters themselves.

Rallies, demonstrations, and even strikes on the eve of the session. Yes, it really happened. Although, judging by the concerted silence of the central newspapers of late, it would have been possible to assume that the situation in Azerbaijan and Armenia had finally returned to normal, that the events connected with Nagorno-Karabakh are becoming a thing of the past, and that as a result of the measures adopted this question has been resolved once and for all. Of course, this is what everyone would like.

However, it is impermissible to present wishful thinking as reality. The efforts undertaken by the CPSU Central Committee and the Soviet Government to ensure the normalization of the situation in and around the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast [NKAO] have, of course, played a great positive role in both republics. However, the following question simply would not go away: Why had the appeal of the extraordinary session of the autonomous oblast soviet to the Supreme Soviets of the Azerbaijan and Armenian SSR's about the NKAO's transfer from one republic to the other still not been considered? After all, this appeal was adopted in Stepanakert as long ago as 20 February.

Armenian SSR voters took the initiative here by instructing the deputies of the republic's Supreme Soviet to include the question of the NKAO soviet deputies' decision on the agenda of the next Armenian Supreme Soviet session. The republic Supreme Soviet Presidium complied with their demand.

Let us be frank: Another factor has also contributed to the exacerbation of tension in recent days—it was the extremely sparse information about what is happening at the trial in Sumgait. Here too the criticism leveled at the press, especially the central press, is quite justified. The local news media covering the problems in Nagorno-Karabakh finally broke their long silence. They are reporting the events without the omissions which so irritate people, and they are calling things by their proper names. Television has provided many people with an opportunity to express their views in this respect, rightly assuming that out of the clash of opinions the truth may emerge more swiftly.

On this occasion too the local press has assisted the timely start of the discussion of the Supreme Soviet draft resolution on the Nagorno- Karabakh deputies' petition. A day before the opening of the session the draft was published in all the local newspapers. Earlier it had been recited on Theater Square in Yerevan. And the discussion of the document started there and then and was continued the same evening during a televised "roundtable" discussion.

We would also like to mention another positive feature of the changes that are taking place in Armenia: Glasnost is finally coming into its own here. Evidence of this is the live television relay from the hall where the republic Supreme Soviet was in session.

The deputies discussed the report on the implementation of the observations and proposals made by Supreme Soviet standing commissions and deputies at the two previous sessions, delivered by Council of Ministers Chairman F. Sarkisyan, and the coreport of the Budget and Planning and other standing commissions. (Report delivered by M. Kotanyan, chairman of the Budget and Planning Commission.) It was noted that many voters' mandates have already been implemented and there has been stricter monitoring of late of the effectiveness of the decisions made. The frank discussion of the problems that have accumulated—not just economic by any means—was a feature of the session. Deputies O. Abramyan, G. Simonyan, and others talked about the heightened responsibility of the people's elected representatives under conditions of restructuring and widening democracy, and about the need to banish stereotyped thinking. Why has the appeal from the autonomous oblast soviet been relegated to the back burner both in Yerevan and in Baku? was the question asked at the session. The answer was: Because plenipotentiary deputies of the two republics' Supreme Soviets, although they knew about it, were waiting for instructions from on high.

"In the years of stagnation interethnic problems accumulated without being resolved," Deputy B. Stepanyan, a teacher, said. "Nor will the accumulated problems be resolved today by appeals alone, without concrete measures to back them up."

Deputy S. Vardanyan, a kolkhoz chairman, stressed in this connection the significance of the CPSU Central Committee Theses for the 19th all-union party conference which envisage within the framework of the restructuring of the political system examining and adopting overdue measures to further develop the Soviet federation. It is necessary to activate those institutions of the political system through which national interests will be revealed and coordinated.

The session adopted a resolution which says, in particular, that in view of the tense situation in and around Nagorno-Karabakh and also the wishes of the Armenian population of the NKAO and Armenia, and guided by Article 70 of the USSR Constitution on nations' right to free self-determination, consent is given to the NKAO's incorporation into the Armenian SSR. It was decided to ask the USSR Supreme Soviet to examine this issue and resolve it positively. The appeal to the Azerbaijan SSR Supreme Soviet expresses the hope that this decision will not upset the traditional good-neighborly relations between the two republics and will be understood by the Azerbaijani people. Deputies talked with great concern

about the possible consequences of the mounting emotions around the Nagorno-Karabakh problem. Yes, we are all learning democracy, we are learning in difficult, sometimes extreme conditions. And it is exceedingly important here that people's social activeness should be counterbalanced by their political culture, the ability to listen to other opinions and see alternative solutions, and by profound respect for order, because democracy and license are incompatible concepts. And it should be plainly stated that at this extremely tense and occasionally dramatic time by no means everyone is displaying enough restraint and composure.

The Armenian SSR Supreme Soviet condemned the crimes committed against the Armenian population in February 1988 and offered profound condolences to the families and relatives of the dead.

A standing commission on interethnic relations and international education was set up, and the decrees of the republic's Supreme Soviet Presidium were ratified. The session was addressed by Armenian Communist Party Central Committee First Secretary S. Arutyunyan.

Opinion Needs 'Shaping' in Tranceucasus

PM1606160188 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 16 Jun 88 p 2

[Own correspondent A. Sarkisyan article: "Concerns and Hopes"]

[Text] Yerevan—It seems that Theater Square in Yerevan will soon be more popular than London's Hyde Park. As on the famous Speakers' Corner, people are saying what they think from the stairs of the opera theater. They are frankly and very eagerly expressing their ideas, some of which would have been considered "seditious" in the period of stagnation. Sometimes the speakers get really carried away. But they are confident that even this right is guaranteed them by the USSR Constitution. True, unlike London, some members of the audience in Yerevan may hiss off a speaker they do not like.

To get onto a more serious note, after the stormy months of February and March, when it seemed as if the situation in the republic was becoming more stable again, a fresh outburst of emotion occurred at the end of May. This was preceded by a major event in the life of the republic. As is well known, the Armenian Communist Party Central Committee plenum relieved K.S. Demirchyan of his duties as first secretary and elected S.G. Arutyunyan to the post. This piece of news was received by the people calmly and with satisfaction. There was also a change of leadership in Azerbaijan. It seemed as if the time had come to comprehensively analyze recent events in and around Nagorno-Karabakh and look for alternative solutions.

Then suddenly, on Sunday 22 May, the news came in that Armenian workers and employees at industrial enterprises in Stepanakert had gone on strike. Why? After all, the demonstrations and rallies in Stepanakert and Yerevan had ended in response to the Appeal by the General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee on 26 February to the working people and peoples of Azerbaijan and Armenia. People had returned to normal life. If it were not for the tragic events in Sumgait, I am sure that reason would have finally gained the upper hand over emotion....

So what happened? More rumors. They proved sufficient to ensure that people's excited minds suddenly stopped heeding the voice of reason.

It is obviously time to recognize that restructuring is hardest of all for political workers. Now it is not enough to be "with the people"; what is more important is to have the right, the faith, and the plan to lead people.... However, let us leave the politicians to their problems and return to the events in Yerevan, in Theater Square.

So what are people talking about? I talked to dozens of people, agreed, argued, tried to prove my point of view, saw their disappointment, listened to the speakers, looked into people's faces as they stood shoulder to shoulder, sincerely believing that they are united by one idea, and felt convinced that what they need most is dialogue, clear, full information, discussion, and cogent arguments from the other side. But unfortunately we have not yet learned to take the lead in shaping public opinion instead of hurrying after it like an old man out of breath as he tries to catch up with the young and teach them on the move.

"We are tired of contradictory, mutually exclusive information and tired of the rumors to which propaganda shows no official reaction...."

"A trial should be held in Sumgait involving representatives of the public from the two republics concerned...."

"We realize that a demonstration, especially a sit-in, is not the best way to establish democracy, but what are we supposed to do? We want to see a fair solution to the issue."

"We have been told that our republic's session does not have the authority to decide this issue and that the request made by the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast can only be satisfied with the mutual consent of the two republics' supreme soviets. This is indicated in a clause of the USSR Constitution. But if, in trying to resolve the dispute, a legal impasse is reached, this means that the relevant articles of the law are untenable and must be reviewed...."

"We do not understand the attitude taken by the mass media, particularly the central press organs. Why are they keeping quiet? How can there be any talk of glasnost under these circumstances?..."

I have deliberately quoted people's remarks without "touching them up." They are not only speaking like this in the square: They are expressing themselves like this on the television screen, in the newspapers, on the radio, and at meetings in labor collectives. Whether they are right or not does not concern them. If there is a demand for information this demand should be satisfied. Otherwise tension arises, people start guessing, concocting their own versions, sometimes start listening to loudmouths, and resort to extreme forms of protest.

The democratization process that we have begun has unfortunately set us unexpected problems, such as how to react to an extreme situation. We do not have ready-made, scientifically substantiated, model answers. I do have a reason for saying this. Alarming opinions were revealed in a poll of the demonstration participants conducted by the Yerevan State University Applied Sociology Department—the only real action taken, incidentally, to study public opinion. In response to the question "Why was this form of expression of will chosen?" typical answers went something like this: "The traditional forms of action possible have had no effect on our government"; "We have students sitting here—they do not know of any more effective forms of action. Give them a few hints." And so on. The overwhelming majority of respondents were sure that the sit-in demonstration in no way ran counter to the aims and tasks of the state at the present stage, accorded with our moral norms, and was not illegal.

Why have I given you this information? To say once again that the people are open to dialogue. Intelligent political words and actions are needed to defuse the tension. After all, the constant, wearing sense of expectation in tens of thousands of people gathering in the square every day is beginning to degenerate into a desire to take matters into their own hands.

Lithuania 'Rehabilitating' Stalin 'Victims'

LD1606164888 Moscow World Service in English 1410 GMT 16 Jun 88

[Text] Lithuania is rehabilitating the people who were deported to other regions in the Soviet Union in 1941 and '49. A meeting to commemorate the victims of Stalin's purges has taken place in the Lithuanian capital Vilnius. An assistant Lithuanian procurator general, (Yurgis Barkutyenis), elaborates:

[Begin (Barkutyenis) recording in vernacular with superimposed English translation] Many of those purged suffered for crimes that they had never committed. It's difficult to reconsider all the cases that came up 40 years ago. This will take some time but the Lithuanian procurator's office is trying to restore the truth in every single case. The task is laborious and responsible. Sometimes we don't have enough facts or evidence and some cases are vague. When this does not have principle significance we rehabilitate. [end recording]

The Lithuanian procurator's office has already checked more than 15,000 applications from the people who were purged. It has rehabilitated more than a half of them. The Lithuanian legal expert said the work had been especially energetic since last autumn, after Mikhail Gorbachev made a speech to the 70th anniversary of the Russian Socialist Revolution. Mind you, he said, the Procurator's Office began reconsidering the cases of the deported Lithuanians immediately after Stalin's personality cult was exposed more than 30 years ago. It's a pity, he said, that this important process was not completed then.

More requests for rehabilitation are coming in now. None will be left without consideration. The assistant Lithuanian procurator general (?Yurgis Bakutyenis) completed by saying that justice must prevail.

Kazakh Central Committee Plenum Reported

PM1606092588 Alma-Ata KAZAKHSTANSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 5 Jun 88 p 1

[Unattributed "Information Report" "On Kazakh Communist Party Central Committee Plenum"]

[Text] The 12th Kazakh Communist Party Central Committee Plenum was held 4 June. The plenum examined the question "of the organizational political activity of the republic's party organizations in fulfilling the CPSU Central Committee resolution 'on the work of the Kazakh republican party organization in the working people's international and patriotic education.'"

G.V. Kolbin, first secretary of the Kazakh Communist Party Central Committee, delivered the Central Committee Bureau report on this question.

The following took part in the discussion: M.S. Mendybayev, first secretary of the Alma-Ata Kazakh Communist Party Obkom; Yu.N. Trofimov, first secretary of the Aktyubinsk Kazakh Communist Party Obkom; A.K. Zhakupov, first secretary of the Dzhambul Kazakh Communist Party Obkom; A.G. Braun, first secretary of the Tselinograd Kazakh Communist Party Obkom; D.Ye. Abdrakhimova, Kazakh SSR minister of social security; A.D. Borodin, chairman of the Kazakh SSR State Committee for Vocational and Technical Education; V.M. Miroshnik, chairman of the Kazakh SSR KGB; Zh.U. Razymbetova, operator at the "Makatneft" oil and gas extraction administration, Guryev Oblast; K.B. Boztayev, first secretary of the Semipalatinsk Kazakh Communist Party Obkom; K.A. Abdullayev, deputy chairman of the Kazakh SSR Council of Ministers and chairman of the republic's Gosplan; A.V. Milkin, first secretary of the East Kazakhstan Kazakh Communist Party Obkom; B. Mustapayeva, rice grower at the

"Chirkeyliyskiy" sovkhoz, Kzyl-Orda Oblast; Ye. Rakhmadiyev, first secretary of the board of the Kazakhstan Composers Union; Z.K. Kamalidenov, chairman of the Kazakh SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium; I. Atadhzanov, leader of a cotton growers' team at the "Kommuna" kolkhoz, Turkestanskiy Rayon, Chimkent Oblast; V.N. Gumenyuk, first secretary of the Borovskiy Kazakh Communist Party Raykom, Kustanay Oblast; Ye.G. Yezhikov-Babakhanov, first secretary of the Dzhezkazgan Kazakh Communist Party Obkom; O.O. Suleymenov, first secretary of the Kazakhstan Writers Union board; R.E. Litman, leader of a tunnelers' team at the "Karagandaugol" production association's V.I. Lenin mine; Ye. Gabdullin, senior horse herd at the T. Masin Sovkhoz, Ural Oblast; B.A. Tulepbayev, director of the Kazakh Communist Party Central Committee Institute of Party History; and M.I. Isinaliyev, Kazakh SSR foreign minister.

G.V. Kolbin delivered the concluding speech at the plenum.

The plenum adopted a resolution on the question under discussion which will be published in the press.

V.S. Bondarchuk, responsible worker of the CPSU Central Committee, took part in the plenum's work.

Slow Progress Seen in Ukraine Restructuring

AU1506155488 Kiev PRAVDA UKRAINY in Russian 11 Jun 88 p 2

[Unattributed report: "In the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee"]

[Text] The Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee Politburo has examined the progress made in bringing about a radical economic reform in the republic. It was noted that, in conformity with the decisions of the 27th party congress and the June (1987) CPSU Central Committee Plenum, the party committees and administrative and economic organs had worked purposefully to speed up socioeconomic development and to intensify communal production. Paramount attention has been given to the efforts to perfect the structure of economic management and to switch over associations and enterprises to the principles of full economic accountability, self-recoupment, and self-financing. Under the valid USSR law on the enterprise (association), labor collectives, scientists, and specialists have concentrated their efforts on fulfilling the 12th 5-Year Plan, on raising the effectiveness of communal production and the rates of labor productivity, and on improving the product quality.

A general scheme, which has been worked out for the management of the republic's national economy, calls for abolishing 9 ministries and departments and reducing the administrative and management personnel by 93,000. Concrete measures have been taken to improve the financial situation of national economic branches and to cut the number of unprofitable and slightly profitable production units. Some 2,400 associations and enterprises with a staff of 8.5 million have been switched over to full economic accountability and self-financing. Ivano-Frankovsk, Crimean, and Chernovtsy Oblast enterprises and organizations of the agro-industrial complex have begun to work under the new conditions. Labor collective councils, already numbering 24,000, are playing their role with increasing effectiveness.

Appreciable progress has been made in the process of promoting the initiative, economic thinking, and the entrepreneurship of cadres, and in their creative approach to the matter at hand. The aspiration to make fuller use of the available production potential, to speed up the reconstruction and reequipment of enterprises, to save resources, and to foster discipline and good organization is ubiquitous. Intra-unit economic accountability, advanced forms of collective labor organization, leasing, the family, and other forms of contracting, cooperative, and individual labor activity are growing stronger.

All this has facilitated positive changes in economic development. Since the beginning of the 5-year period, the republic has met the planned targets for practically all basic indices. In the 2 years, the volume of industrial production increased 8.6 percent, against the 7.1 percent under the 5-year plan. Labor productivity rose 8.9 percent, against the planned 6.7 percent. For the first time, industrial production increased without any numerical increase in personnel. Labor productivity was growing faster than wages. The average annual overall production of agriculture rose 7.1 percent compared with the 2.5 percent in the last 5-year period. The profitability of kolkhoz and sovkhoz production amounted to nearly 25 percent. The volumes of capital construction and transport operations increased.

Compared with the corresponding period of 1987, in the 5 months of the current year the volume of industrial production increased 5.3 percent and labor productivity 6 percent against the respective 4 and 3.9 percent targeted for 1988. In the period from January to April, profits from the national economy rose 14 percent, and above-plan profits totaled R957 million. In construction, the plans for contracted operations were fulfilled, and the targets for increasing labor productivity were met. In agriculture, there was an increase in the procurement of meat, milk, and eggs.

Appreciable advances were made in the social sphere. Capital investments used for these purposes in the last 2 years exceeded the 5-year targets by R2.7 billion. More than 7 million square meters of housing space, general education schools for 43,400 pupils, preschool establishments for 8,600 children, hospitals with 4,300 beds, and clubs and houses of culture with 35,300 seats were built in excess of the plan. The production of consumer goods increased 11.5 percent, against the 10.6 percent provided for by the 5-year plan.

At the same time, the process of restructuring the economy has been slow, and thus far radical changes for the better have not taken place in the main sectors of its development. The rates provided under the 5-year plan for increasing the national income and for reducing material intensiveness in production have not been achieved. Individual tasks set by the Food Program and the comprehensive program for developing the production of goods and for rendering payable services have not been accomplished. Many enterprises working under the new management conditions have failed to improve their basic economic indices.

The Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee believes that the Ukrainian SSR Council of Ministers Presidium, its commission for improving management and increasing the effectiveness of the national economy, as well as branch ministries and departments exert insufficient influence on the course of the economic reform. The principled directives of the June (1987) CPSU Central Committee Plenum on restructuring planning and on boosting the role of enterprises in this important matter have not been fully complied with. The appropriate persistence and adherence to principles have not been displayed in defining economic norms and state orders. The development of the labor collectives' initiative has been seriously hindered by many unsettled problems in the field of material-technical supply.

Branch ministries and departments are slow in overcoming conservatism and bureaucratic methods of management by command. Many of them have failed to provide enterprises with the necessary conditions to score high final results. Acting against the USSR Law on the State Enterprise (Association), they often try to encroach upon the rights of labor collectives and avoid settling acute, immediate problems in order to have favorable overall indices.

Some party committees and basic organizations still have not managed to restructure the style and methods of their work under the conditions of democratizing production management and of switching over the national economy to economic accountability and self-financing. In a number of cases, they substitute for administrative and economic organs, and take upon themselves the direct accomplishment of current economic tasks.

The Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee Politburo took into consideration the steps taken by the republic's Council of Ministers, ministries, and departments to speed up the implementation of basic clauses concerning the new mechanism of management, to ensure that all management links strictly observe the requirements of the USSR Law on the State Enterprise (Association), and to provide the necessary economic conditions for associations, enterprises, and organizations to switch over to and work rhythmically on the principles of full economic accountability and self-financing.

The Ukrainian SSR Council of Ministers, Gosplan, Gossnab, ministries, and departments have been instructed to pay particular attention to improvements in the practice of planning, of defining economic norms, state orders, and ceilings; to ensure that machine building and the production base of capital construction develop at priority rates; and to expand the wholesale trade in means of production. It was emphasized that there is an urgent need to more persistently promote intra-unit economic accountability, various forms of contracting, cooperative, and individual labor activity, and to give priority to the production of goods in order to meet the consumers' needs more fully.

In drafting the 1989 plan for the republic's economic and social development, the Ukrainian SSR Gosplan has been commissioned to find reserves to maximally compensate for the shortfalls in the 5-year plan that were incurred in the 2 years in important indices such as increasing the national income and the population's real incomes.

Oblispolkoms, gorispolkoms, and rayispolkoms are expected to take greater advantage of the rights granted to them to ensure the comprehensive economic and social development of the territories within their jurisdiction, to step up the production of foodstuffs and consumer goods, to enhance the sphere of services, and to settle all problems that directly involve improvements in people's working and living conditions.

Obkoms, gorkoms, and raykoms have been instructed to quickly master the whole range of forms and methods of management developed by the party, to resolutely check any attempts to encroach upon the law on the state enterprise or to run production by command and pressure. They are expected to give basic party organizations concrete assistance in restructuring their activity under the conditions of democratizing production management, in forming labor collective councils, and in boosting the latter's role.

The Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee Secretariat and departments have been commissioned to intensify their assistance to and to increase the responsibility of, the party committees and Communist leaders in the strict compliance with the basic clauses of radical economic reform, and of the decisions of the June (1987) CPSU Central Committee Plenum. Particular attention was called to the need to train and retrain cadres, and to ensure that the latter master all modern methods of management.

Zaykov Meets with Moscow Architects

PM1606123588 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 16 Jun 88 Second Edition p 3

[TASS report: "Glory of the Capital's Architecture"]

[Text] Together with the entire Soviet people, Moscow's architects and construction industry workers are now discussing the CPSU Central Committee Theses for the

19th all-union party conference. The large-scale socio-economic tasks outlined in this document place serious responsibility on them. This was stressed at a 15 June meeting between L.N. Zaykov, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and first secretary of the Moscow CPSU Gorkom, and Moscow architects, designers, and town planners.

Over the years of Soviet power many social and town planning problems have been resolved in Moscow and a powerful construction industry has been formed. Many expressive architectural works have been created, the best of which have entered the treasury of our own and world culture.

At the same time negative trends have emerged in recent decades in the capital's development. Quantitative indicators have acquired a leading role and nudged aside the task of shaping Moscow as a very big world center and improving its architectural and artistic appearance. The city has begun to lose its individual silhouette, diversity of form, and vivid colors.

The first steps aimed at improving the standard of the capital's architecture have been taken today. A public town planning council has been created and drafts are being elaborated for a new general plan for the Moscow region for the period through 2010 and for a detailed layout for the city's historic center. Programs for the intensification of construction production are being implemented.

It is essential to restore to Moscow its leadership in the comprehensive solution of economic and social tasks. The capital's appearance should reflect our people's very rich material and spiritual culture and their peaceful creative goals.

Zaykov Addresses Auto Plant's Aktiv

PM1606113588 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 11 Jun 88 Second Edition p 3

[TASS report under the general heading "Devoting Our Labor and Energy to Restructuring": "Moscow"]

[Text] On 10 June, L.N. Zaykov, member of the Politburo, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and first secretary of Moscow party gorkom, had a meeting with the party aktiv and representatives of the labor collective of Moscow's I.A. Likhachev Motor Vehicle Plant [Zil]. The CPSU Central Committee Theses were at the focus of its participants' attention.

Ye.G. Mikernikov, secretary of a block party committee [partkom korpusa]; N.M. Georgiyevskaya, coremaker and delegate to the 19th all-union party conference; Yu.K. Konov, chief of the main steel and nonferrous metal casting shop; N.M. Pyatchits, assembler-fitter; Ye.A. Brakov, general director of the Zil Production Association; and others—in all, more than 20 working people from the plant—spoke with conviction of the fact that the Communists and the entire collective have sufficient strength and reserves for a decisive breakthrough in the main areas of restructuring and for the consistent realization of the party's policy of renewal.

The CPSU Central Committee secretary spent several hours answering numerous questions from the motor vehicle builders about preparations for the conference, about the way in which delegates were elected in the country and the capital, and about overcoming everything that is still holding up restructuring.

L.N. Zaykov spoke of his profound impression from the meetings and talks in the enterprise's shops. People are putting many interesting suggestions to the upcoming conference, he pointed out.

The party Central Committee Theses, which are now being discussed by Communists and nonparty people with such ardent interest, are full of living Leninist thought. The Theses generalize the achievements of scientific thought and political practice secured in the course of restructuring and the radical renewal of all aspects of life.

The level of the generalizations contained in them makes it possible not to fetter debate and enables every Soviet person to express his opinion on fundamental social questions. The discussion of the Central Committee Theses is a new stage in the Soviet people's mastering of political culture.

It is possible to state most definitely that this discussion has not turned into a simple exchange of opinions, the informing of higher organizations about support from below, or a flood of reports. We are participating in a collective search.

We advocate pluralism of opinions not just verbally but in practice—but pluralism on a socialist basis, on socialist grounds.

Our socialist choice has been made once and for all, and we will not retreat from socialism. But socialism is not a society stuck in its development. Genuine socialism is a constantly improving organism, which dialectically denies everything obsolete and rejects everything that does not correspond to its nature.

The task of restructuring is precisely to purge socialism of everything artificial that has fettered people's initiative and prevented the individual from revealing himself.

The chief trend in society and the most important result of the first stage of restructuring is the Soviet people's growing support for the revolutionary transformations in the country. This support is expressed in the desire to work better and display social activeness.

This does not mean that restructuring does not have opponents. It does. There is, above all, conservatism. It is supported by the forces of those who are forced by restructuring to revise their principle of life—to take more and give less—and who cannot or do not wish to abandon dogmatic notions of socialism.

An attack on restructuring is also being waged "from the left." The avant-garde phrasemongering, nationalism, chauvinism—we encounter these, too, today. Unfortunately, blatant leftism does not always receive a proper rebuff from Communists and the ideological aktiv.

You have, of course, heard of the "Pamyat" Society. It recently held a sensational meeting in your Palace of Culture. The workers dealt the demagogues a resolute rebuff. And it serves them right. They have no business hiding behind Zil's glorious name.

But the problem is far more complex. It is not just a noble cause; it is our common duty with you to keep the memory of the past and of sacred pages in our history. I believe that Zil Communists and Komsomol members must head this patriotic work, driving bawlers and crawlers out of it, and keep the memory of the motherland's history and art.

I would like to emphasize that it will require the strenuous work of all Soviet people and, of course, of Muscovites to implement the ideas enshrined in the Central Committee Theses and the decisions which the conference will adopt. It is necessary to come out resolutely against the lightweight sentiments which still prevail among some of us: The conference will be held, they say, and all of life will at once change as though at the wave of a magic wand. There are no miracles in social development.

The conference will outline a plan of our society's further restructuring, but all of us—Communists, above all—will have to implement this plan. Therefore, a mood for work is now more necessary than ever.

The Theses address today's problems, which must be resolved without putting them off until tomorrow. Their realization will be the basis of our long-term development.

The 3 years since the CPSU Central Committee April (1985) Plenum are a short time for radical economic transformations. However, positive processes are in evidence and are growing.

If we speak of Moscow with its great scientific and industrial potential, changes for the better are visible here. Fulfillment of the contract delivery plan, for example, stood at 99.9 percent during the first 5 months of this year.

Your association has also taken a step forward. Suffice it to say that during the first half of the 12th 5-Year Plan, Zil achieved practically the same the growth rates for production volume and labor productivity as were achieved during the whole of the 11th 5-Year Plan.

The switch to new management conditions and the extension of self-management are playing an ever greater role in achieving these results. The restructuring of economic thinking today is one of the burning problems.

L.N. Zaykov dwelt in detail on tasks on whose resolution the effectiveness of economic levers of management depends. He devoted special attention to the improvement of internal economic accountability [khozraschet] and the introduction of contract forms of labor organization.

It must not be forgotten—and the CPSU Central Committee Theses emphasize this—that we are only at the initial stage of economic reform. However, it is still not working at full stretch. Workers and engineers have spoken of this today.

But it is also important to see something else. The conservatism of a considerable number of economic cadres and their allegiance to old leadership methods are to blame for the fact that a fundamental turning point has still not been reached in the economic sphere. A discrepancy between words and deeds remains common.

A large section of the speech was devoted to problems of accelerating scientific and technical progress. In this connection, progress in realizing the "Progress-95" program for intensifying the capital's economy was analyzed.

The CPSU Central Committee Theses, L.N. Zaykov went on to point out, emphasize that a strong social policy is one of the chief priorities in the party's activity. He reported on how the plans aimed at improving Muscovites' working, living, study, and leisure conditions are being implemented.

Special attention was devoted to the pace and quality of construction of housing and sociocultural and consumer projects, to saturation of the domestic market with goods, and to expansion of the services sphere.

The policy of restructuring and accelerating the country's socioeconomic development is inseparably linked with democratization and with the assertion of socialist self-management. Much has already been done on this path. But all this, as the CPSU Central Committee Theses point out, is just a runup to resolving the tremendously significant and complex task of the profound and all-around democratization of the party and society.

After analyzing in depth the processes occurring in the economy, in the social sphere, and in the spiritual life of Soviet society, the party's Central Committee arrived at the conclusion on the need to reform Soviet society's political system. The Communist Party, which is the political vanguard of the working class and of all working people, is the leading force and chief guarantor of the development of democracy.

A persistent struggle is being waged today to master political methods of leadership and to overcome inertia of thinking and conservatism. What is required of every party organization and every Communist is not just impeccable work in his own section, not just the pure and honest makeup of the party member, but also development of the ability to be an organizer of the masses.

Specific examples from the life of Moscow were then used to show the need to restore in full the role and powers of the soviets of people's deputies. The new system of organizing territorial management, whose active introduction is resolutely being started in the capital, was examined from this angle.

The development of democratic principles and self-management in production is inseparably linked with galvanization of the activities of labor collective councils. The councils, which have been elected in more than 3,000 of the city's enterprises, today embrace more than 90,000 working people. Almost 60 percent of them are workers. Election of leaders has become the practice.

Restructuring is gathering momentum and becoming a factor of world significance. It needs a foreign policy which expresses its humanistic essence.

The first steps have been taken on this path. The Soviet-U.S. Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles signed in Washington last year and recently ratified is of tremendous significance. The Moscow summit meeting between M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and U.S. President R. Reagan was a very important event in international life. A big step has been taken on the way to reducing nuclear arms, strengthening world security, and improving Soviet-U.S. relations.

In conclusion, L.N. Zaykov said:

The preparations for the 19th all-union party conference are entering the concluding phase. The makeup of delegates has been defined. The capital's party organization will be represented by 319 Communists.

During the discussion of the Central Committee Theses, Communists and residents of the city are making specific proposals and giving advice to their delegates. I wish to assure you that the Moscow City party organization's delegation perceives this as a mandate for work at the 19th all-union party conference.

Religious Celebrations Continue in Ukraine

LD1606150188 Moscow TASS in English 1411 GMT 16 Jun 88

[Text] Kiev June 16 TASS—The third day of official celebrations in the Ukrainian capital, marking the millennium of Christianity in Russia, opened with an open-air prayer service on the bank of the Dnieper, attended by thousands of people, believers and atheists.

Coming from different parts of the Soviet Union and abroad, they heard the festive liturgy conducted in the Kiev-Pechory Lavra, or monastery of the first rank, featuring some of the finest examples of Christian temples.

The attending dignitaries included Metropolitan Filaret of Kiev and Galich, patriarchal exarch to the Ukraine, and other hierarchs of the Russian Orthodox Church along with representatives of other orthodox churches, world and regional Christian organizations, and other confessions and religious movements.

Boris Arapovich, director of the Institute of Biblical Translations from Sweden, said the scale of the millennium celebrations indicated the reach of positive change in Soviet society.

"These loudspeakers on vans here as well as those around the St Vladimir Cathedral transmitting the prayers to a great many people around the temple are one striking sign of the increased democratization and openness in this country," he said.

Arapovich said another sign of the perestroyka effort for change in the Soviet Union has been the transfer of worship houses and monasteries by the government back to the church and increased editions of religious literature.

Arapovich, who said he is a Protestant, added:

"But these are only the first steps. You will, of course, understand me, a Christian believer who has devoted his life to publishing the Bible in different languages that are spoken in the world, if I say that the number of theological books printed in this country is yet insufficient.

"But we have presented the Russian Orthodox Church with 150,000 Bibles in Russian. And the understanding of the problems of the church that is now shown in the Soviet Union makes me optimistic about the future."

There were tears of joy during the service in the eyes of an elderly man who identified himself as Vadim Ordovskiy-Tanayevskiy.

"The vicissitudes of life have landed me, a man of Russian background, far from my native land, in Venezuela. But I have never forgotten my language and my faith.

"I have come the long way from Venezuela here to share the joy of celebration on the land of my ancestors. And while here, in this sacred place, I am praying for Lord to give all of us the gift of peace and prosperity wherever we live".

Demichev Receives Chief of U.S. Interfaith Body

PM1706092188 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 14 Jun 88 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report under the general heading: "Friendly Conversations"]

[Text] On 13 June P.N. Demichev received A. Schneier, president of the Appeal of Conscience Foundation (United States).

In the course of a friendly conversation, emphasis was placed on the importance of meetings between the leaders of the USSR and the United States and of representatives of business circles and public and religious organizations in terms of improving Soviet-U.S. relations, strengthening international security, and establishing a climate of trust and mutual understanding in the world.

Our foundation, which is a Catholic-Protestant-Jewish organization, the guest said, is in favor of religious freedom and of peace and friendship among peoples of all religions. We are satisfied with the fact that the restructuring taking place in the Soviet Union has also affected the attitude toward believers. The widespread celebration of the millennium of the baptism of Russia is a graphic example of mutual respect between the state and the church. It has also promoted widening of contacts among the clergy of various countries.

Professor S.L. Zivs, first deputy chairman of the anti-Zionist committee of the Soviet public, was present at the conversation.

Dobrynin Receives Evangelist Billy Graham

PM1706084788 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 14 Jun 88 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Religious Figure Received"]

[Text] On 13 June CPSU Central Committee Secretary A.F. Dobrynin received eminent U.S. religious and public figure Billy Graham at the latter's request.

Talking about his striking impressions of the celebrations of the millennium of the baptism of Russia, to which he had been invited, B. Graham noted that as a result of the Soviet Union's policy of restructuring, openness, and glasnost the jubilee was an outstanding event not only in the life of the Russian Orthodox Church, but of the whole of mankind. We religious figures, B. Graham said, wish M.S. Gorbachev's policy success.

During a friendly conversation the common opinion was expressed that religious circles and all public forces in the USSR and the United States can do much for the further constructive development of Soviet-U.S. relations, for the strengthening of trust, and for rapprochement between our peoples so that the "enemy image" vanishes forever from these relations. It is important not to relax efforts in this sphere.

News Conference Held on Millennium Celebrations

LD1706090688 Moscow TASS in English 0900 GMT 17 Jun 88

[Test] Moscow June 17 TASS—The celebration of the millennium of Christianity in Russia has by far exceeded the church framework and turned into a nationwide event, observed speakers at today's news conference in the Soviet Foreign Ministry's Press Centre in Moscow.

Metropolitan Pitirim of Volokolamsk and Yuriev, who heads the Moscow Patriarchate's publishing department, told newsmen on the occasion of the completion of the millennium festivities that the participation of Christians of all denominations and representatives of other faiths in the event had made it truly international in its significance.

Most queries were related to the relationship between the church and the state in the conditions of perestroyka, or restructuring, currently under way in the Soviet Union.

Guests of the Russian Orthodox Church, Dr Heinz-Joachim Held, chairman of the Central Committee of the World Council of Churches, and the Rev Billy Graham, joined the Russian priests in fielding the questions.

"The celebrations have convinced me that the Soviet state has adopted a serious attitude towards the church," said Dr Held. "The Russian Orthodox Church is one thousand years old, but the festivities leave no doubt that it is young and strong and has a future."

The Rev Billy Graham agreed with this assessment. He added that the measure of freedom for the church had grown considerably since his previous trip to the Soviet Union.

"I was impressed by the multitude of people who attended church services," he noted. This equally applied to the Baptists with whom the American evangelist had several meetings.

He said he was leaving the Soviet Union with a sense that perestroyka was working. This policy had already exerted and would continue to exert influence on the status of the church, the evangelist added.

'No Prisoners of Conscience'

LD1706131088 Moscow TASS in English 1116 GMT 17 Jun 88

[Text] Moscow June 17 TASS—"Our church jubilee has acquired broad dimensions and turned into a truly international event," Metropolitan Pitirim of Volokolamsk and Yuriev who heads the Moscow Patriarchate's Publishing Department, has pointed out.

He was speaking at a news conference held here today to sum up the cleebrations marking the 1,000th anniversary of the baptism of Russia.

The festivities were carried out by the Russian Orthodox Church in Moscow, Kiev, Leningrad and Vladimir.

Participants in the news conference fielded numerous questions. On the attitude of the Russian Orthodox Church to the problem of settling regional conflicts, Metropolitan Filaret of Minsk and Belorussia recalled that the Local Council (General Assembly) of the church adopted a document stressing the need for the elimination of tension.

Metropolitan Filaret of Kiev and Galich added that the most difficult problems could be resolved, given goodwill, and referred to the example of the Afghanistan settlement.

Many questions were asked about the effect of perestroyka, or restructuring, on the status of the church. Konstantin Kharchev, chairman of the Council for Religious Affairs at the USSR council of Ministers, pointed out that noticeable changes had occurred lately in church-state relations.

He singled out the ground-breaking ceremony for a new temple to mark the millennium of Christianity in russia. The first to be built in this country since 1917.

Nearly 90 Russian Orthodox communities had been registered in the past five months alone, Kharchev said. Overall, the Soviet state officially recognised 160 religious organisations over that period.

Asked by a "Voice of America" correspondent about the fate of so-called prisoners of conscience, Kharchev replied that there none in the USSR.

"No one in the Soviet Union is tried and put into jail for belief in God. But we do have believers who were imprisoned for offences under various articles of the penal code."

American evangelist Billy Graham and Dr. Heinz-Joachim held, chairman of the Central Committee of the World Council of Churches, told newsmen that they had been greatly impressed by the scale and openness of the celebrations.

They were unanimous that perestroyka was working, which had its effect on the status of the church, too.

Church Festivities End in Leningrad

LD1606205588 Moscow TASS in English 1929 GMT 16 Jun 88

[Text] Leningrad June 16 TASS—A sacred liturgy at the St Trinity Cathedral of the Aleksandr Nevskiy Monastery became the culmination of the last day of the festivities held here and devoted to the 1000th anniversary of Christianity in Russia. The mass was broadcast to a people-filled square adjoining the cathedral.

Summing up the results of the jubilee programme in Leningrad, Aleksey, Metropolitan of Leningrad and Novgorod, pointed out "that the real results of new approaches to state-church relations are developing brighter and fuller under the conditions of perestroyka and democratization of Soviet society. Believers regard themselves belonging to the same family with nonbelievers and are ready to cooperate with their compatriots in all spheres of social life. That is precisely why the Russian Orthodox Church fully backs perestroyka. Believers hold near and dear cares and difficulties which fell to the lot of their brethren and are ready spiritually and materially to support them: The church donated big sums to the assistance fund of families of soldiers who fell in Afghanistan."

The festivities in Leningrad rounded off with a gala concert at the Kirov opera and ballet theatre. Performers included the mixed choir of the Leningrad theological academy, seminary and the precentor's division, the men's choir of the metropolitan see and the academic choir named after Glinka. They rendered choir works of various epochs. Church psalms and a salute to the motherland and the Russian people sounded powerfully and joyously.

NASH SOVREMENNIK Attacks Shmelev

AU1706095488 Paris AFP in English 0934 GMT 17 Jun 88

[Text] Moscow, June 17 (AFP)—A Soviet monthly in its latest issue has attacked radical economists who support Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev's reforms, charging that their formula for economic salvation would herald a return of Stalinist methods.

Nikolay Shmelev, who in his articles since June last year has defended the need for unemployment, and a convertible ruble, in order to stimulate the economy, was particularly singled out by the monthly NASH SOVREMENNIK in its long diatribe.

"The new proposals of the leftist reformers are the same as the old methods condemned by the party and the people," the monthly said.

NASH SOVREMENNIK recalled that Mr Shmelev had in his first noted article in the June 1987 edition of the monthly NOVYY MIR called for the transfer of workers to other industries and organised migration.

"How does that square with the process of democratisation of society? And how, please, does this remedy invented by Shmelev differ from the 1930s when there was forced migration through the Gulag, or from the Chinese Cultural Revolution which moved young city dwellers into rural work camps," the article demanded.

The word Gulag, made famous through Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn's novel "The Gulag Archipelago" on the horrors of Stalin's labour camps, is a Russian acronym standing for the administration of the country's penal camps.

Although Mr Shmelev has in many public statements called for more radical measures than those adopted by the party leadership, he has been a leading advocate of market-oriented economic reforms which have already been implemented.

The NASH SOVREMENNIK article, published less than two weeks before a special Communist Party conference meets in Moscow to discuss Mr Gorbachev's restructuring drive known as perestroyka, was a further indication of the persistent ideological resistance within the party to the economic reforms.

NASH SOVREMENNIK (our contemporary), the organ of the Russian Federation's writer's union, has the reputation for being a conservative journal, and frequently publishes writers close to the ultra-right Pamyat Russian nationalist movement.

Burlatskiy on Objectives of CPSU Conference

LD1706112588 Moscow in English to Great Britain and Ireland 2300 GMT 16 Jun 88

[Text] The 19th national party conference is due to open in Moscow on 28th June. People here are looking forward to the discussions that will make it possible to speed up perestroyka and overcome the resistance of the conservative forces. There are quite a few people in the party and in Soviet society as a whole who still fear that the current restructuring may have the fate of the unsuccessful reforms of the past years, the Khurschchev period among others. We assume there are listeners who will be interested in hearing the opinion of Dr Fedor Burlatskiy, a leading public figure and journalist who is also one of the prominent experts on philosophical studies. Dr Burlatskiy was a political adviser to Nikita Khrushchev.

Dr Burlatskiy said that on the threshold of the fifties and the sixties he lived through the period of hopes and illusions and of the failure to (?a) certain measure of these hopes. Now I have 10 times more serious hopes than I did in the Khrushchev period. This is because we have a leader who works energetically towards bringing democratization and reforms. There is also the postwar generation of leaders who think and act in the spirit of our time. It's true such people hold not all the posts in our society. What is extremely important however is that public opinion has finally been awakened and that openness has become irreversible. This is what we did not have earlier.

One of the main aims of the party conference is the need to ensure a further democratization within the party. The Soviet Communist Party is the governing party, it is the initiator of the restructuring and it should begin this restructuring from its own ranks. In reference to the need to broaden party democracy, Dr Burlatskiy said this: The establishment of the system under which the party personnel would rotate is (?the) major problem of party democracy. The stay of the party officials on their post should be limited to two terms. In some exceptional cases this period could be lengthened to three terms. The term should be no longer than 5 years I think. This provision should be included in the party rules. It would be correct to introduce similar rules in relation to government bodies and public organizations as well.

You've heard the opinion of a leading Soviet public figure and journalist, Dr Fedor Burlatskiy. He has been elected a delegate to the national party conference due to open in Moscow on 28th June. The conference will discuss key issue of Soviet society's life. Conferences of this kind have not been held since 1941.

Moscow Delegates to Party Conference Viewed

LD1706083788 Moscow TASS in English 0646 GMT 17 Jun 88

[Text] Moscow June 17 TASS—TASS news analyst Boris Prokhorov writes:

Here are some initial data, at first. There are about 10,000 primary organizations of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (CPSU) in Moscow. The primary organizations of the city nominated 3,000 people at the first stage of the selection of candidates for attending the 19th all-union party conference. Three hundred and nineteen delegates were chosen from among them. Who are the people in whom the Communists of Moscow have placed great trust?

When one studies the list of the delegations, it becomes clear that it represents the Moscow Communists in a sufficiently full and proportional way: The delegates are workers, engineers, scientists, servicemen, party workers, and creative intellectuals. This is not an artificial proportionality, I was told at the Moscow City Committee of the CPSU. The selection of delegates was held for the first time without any instructions whatsoever from the party's city committee. Each district of the city independently chose a principle for the selection of candidates and the proportionality of representation took shape naturally, although some changes took place in this field, too. As compared with the composition of

the Moscow delegation attending the 27th congress of the CPSU, the share of party workers on the delegation to the 19th party conference has diminished while that of creative intellectuals has almost doubled.

And one more detail: More than 90 percent of delegates are Communists who were nominated by primary organizations and whose candidacies were publicly discussed and voted upon in work collectives.

Of course, one cannot rule out an error in forming a Moscow delegation: It is for the first time that the election of delegates to a major party forum was held without any regulating instructions. The city committee of the CPSU regard this, I was told, as a sort of experiment, as valuable experience and school. The city committee staff also learn democracy.

Readers View Delegate Election Procedure
PM1406154388 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 11 Jun 88 Morning Edition p3

[Review by Yuriy Orlik, IZVESTIYA deputy editor responsible for letters section under rubric "Reading the Mail": "Lessons for the Future"]

[Text] Be honest: Were you really very interested a couple of years ago as to who would be delegate to a party congress or some other political forum? But suddenly the whole nation is interested to see who will be going to the 19th all-union party conference. Lists of delegates are currently the most read items in the press. Discussion of the electoral procedure is the main topic of the editorial mail. We are waking from our social apathy—this is a sign of the new times. But the mail also reveals something else: It shows how difficult this awakening is and the strength of the resistance to the process of democratizing our society—a resistance that we have still to overcome. However, we could not have expected otherwise, as our country has so long been lacking in a full-blooded political life—a life replaced by ritual.

That is why we will not ignore the "delegate mail," although the conference participants have now been decided. We will take another close look at these letters and try to learn some lessons from the recent campaign.

Many of these letters clearly convey a sense of alarm: The procedure adopted for forming the delegations was not properly thought through and sometimes, according to readers, revealed its obviously undemocratic nature. Basically, it created a system of candidate selection that most favored people working in party bodies. "We have seen the old, extremely familiar picture," Ye. Mudresh from Kharkov wrote, "of elections without choice, elections based on a quota system, elections in which the apparatus of paid functionaries elects itself. This is so strikingly different from the general mood of the public, the substance of virtually every publication in the press, and the spirit of recent top-level party documents that you cannot help but think that word and deed travel in opposite directions in our country." "Despite direct instructions from the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee," S. Semenov from Smolensk observed, "the formation of delegations to the conference followed the same pattern it always did in the stagnation period—behind closed doors, without a broad discussion of the candidates, and without preliminary information on them in the oblast newspaper."

Many envelopes contain cuttings from local newspapers with lists of delegates. Here are some of the comments with which readers accompanied them. "Huh! The same old faces.... The same comrades at all Moscow forums" (V. Severgin, Prokopyevsk). "First secretary.... First secretary.... First secretary.... Does being elected delegate depend on your position?" (A. Konova, Sverdlovsk). "Of the 70 candidates to the plenum the obkom bureau selected 48. Forty eight is the number needed—so we have to vote for 48. What kind of election is this?" (P. Pyanov, chief engineer, Odessa). "I had expected there to be people among the delegates who would be distinguished from us mere mortals not only by the brilliance of their orders and medals—but by the brilliance of their ideas" (Yu. Morkovkin, Simferopol). "The system that gives preference to party committees is unfortunately often at variance with public opinion" (N. Ioffe-Goncharuk, Moscow). "We have here the whole party apparatus plus other bigwigs. But 'for the sake of democracy' they have diluted this list with tractor drivers (women included), dairymaids, and metalworkers" (K. Ilyushina, teacher, Ashkhabad). And, particularly alarming: "If delegates were unaware of any violation of democratic principles in the election procedure, will they be able to defend these principles in the future—at the conference itself?" (A. Kirillov, P. Chichagov, and a total of 25 signatures from associates of the USSR Academy of Sciences Applied Physics Institute, Gorkiy).

Readers plainly associate the system of selecting (not electing!) delegates with the interests of definite social groups. "The nomenklatura has no need of democracy and glasnost," G. Petrova, an engineer from Penza, is convinced. "The apparatus proved the best prepared for the elections," Ye. Parshina from Moscow wrote. "It set about drawing up lists of candidates and holding the traditional consultations (also within the apparatuses). The majority of ordinary Communists were isolated from this work."

Readers point out that it is impossible not to interpret attempts to confine the right to nominate candidates to a narrow circle of elite people as a lack of faith in the political maturity of ordinary Communists who will supposedly stray in the wrong direction if deprived of a guiding hand.

These letters confirm that the old approaches are rejected by the majority. They do not work now. Tomorrow they will be quite impossible.

The broad public interest in who is to be given the mandate of conference delegate has also become apparent in other ways that are unexpected and unusual to our way of thinking and in the context of our political practice. We have witnessed the formation of various organizational committees and initiative groups, the holding of thousands of rallies and spontaneous meetings, the collection of signatures supporting and opposing individual candidates, and also real election demonstrations. Streets, squares, and even stadiums have become the focus of discussions on what had seemed to be internal party matters.

The mailbag and reports by our correspondents tell the following story. Some 8,000 residents of Omsk gathered at the "Dynamo" stadium to express their opinions on the procedure for nominating delegates. Participants in the meeting held in front of the IZVESTIYA building, of which you had a good view from the office windows, demanded that prominent publicists and scientists be additionally elected to the conference. People are also discussing this idea in their letters. Muscovites Yu. Samodurov, A. Sukhov, and S. Mitrokhin (the letter was signed by 100 people in all) suggest that additional mandates be given to people "whom the public would definitely like to see among the conference delegates." "I think the Palace of Congresses would be able to accomodate another 50, if not another 100 people who have done (and will still do, if not deprived of the opportunity) far more for restructuring than many others," A. Bugayev, a student at Moscow University, supported this idea.

It must be said that public interference in the course of the election has not been without its results. For example, the people of Sakhalin were invited by a live broadcast to go to the square by the drama theater to discuss the results of the elections to the party conference in the context of the general situation on the island. A party obkom plenum held several days later released P. Tretyakov from his duties as first secretary of the CPSU Obkom. The decision was made to hand over the "obkom" hotel, hospital, and boarding house to the gorispolkom.

Evidently, uncontrolled forms of influence on the formation of the delegations, like these rallies, for example, have displeased many. Attempts have been made to disclose "troublemakers" and accuse members of initiative groups of the intention to create a "parallel power." Usually without any foundation whatsoever. Does this mean that group interests and personal ambitions did not make themselves felt during the struggle? No, it does not mean that. We were once again able to satisfy ourselves that not only party workers but also ordinary participants in rallies and meetings are incapable of democratic debate and democratically defending their positions. Loudmouths sometimes gained the upper hand. While noting these cases, we must bear in mind that these shortcomings are not the result of too much democracy but too little.

Both the party and society have now gained valuable political experience. It is important not to lose or forget this experience. We must gather and carefully analyze everything proposed by popular initiative and incorporate it, if you like, in the work of the forthcoming forum.

All the necessary lessons must be learned from the campaign in preparation for the conference. For the future. The first is that elections to any representative body and any forum can no longer remain a purely ritual procedure with the result known in advance. They are becoming an arena for social struggle and an expression of pluralist opinion. From now on we cannot count on any decision "from above" being automatically guaranteed unanimous support and approval. The people's political faith in the party is not automatically conferred on individual party workers. This faith has to be earned by each party worker for himself—through his own personal example, work for restructuring, and service to the people.

The elections have very clearly shown that we still have to perfect a democratic procedure for forming delegations to conferences and congresses. The quota system has not disappeared. It has merely changed its name. Because the perhaps understandable concern to ensure that the "oblast is worthily represented by its delegation" has in practice meant that the lists of candidates were compiled in offices as before.

Another lesson from the recent campaign is that participation by broad strata of society in politics is now a fait accompli. As our society becomes more democratic there will be an increase in the influence exerted by nonparty people on the situation within the party and in the extent to which the people control its activity. This is connected with the actual position of the CPSU in the present sociopolitical structure as the sole ruling party on whose policies and political and moral state the fate of society depends. And we must not reject or cut ourselves off from this influence but develop effective ways to take public opinion into consideration.

New figures—people with political acumen, whose words and ideas carry authority and influence—have recently appeared on the social stage. We must all take an interest in ensuring that these people become active assistants of the party.

And the last point. Considering that the forthcoming conference is arousing enormous interest and the public is having some doubts about the delegates, it would certainly be right to ensure that the conference is conducted openly, with both television and radio relaying direct broadcasts from the Palace of Congresses.

Italian Paper on Yaroslavl Demonstration

PM1606150888 Milan L'UNITA in Italian 12 Jun 88 p10

[Giulietto Chiesa, Sergio Sergi dispatch: "Yaroslavl's 'Lesson in Glasnost'"]

[Text] Yaroslavl—"It was a lesson for us." Anatoliy Muravyev and Gennadiy Kalinin looked around them. We were on the Volga embankment near the river station next to the monument to the poet Nekrasov. The large and unexpected demonstration by the inhabitants of Yaroslavl took place right here last Wednesday. We were brought on this pilgrimage to the fateful site of the challenge to the local party by two obkom leaders—organization chief Muravyev and propaganda chief Kalinin. How many people were there? Gennadiy Kalinin made a broad gesture with his hand: "Maybe 1,500-2,000. You know...journalists often exaggerate...."

It was only 2 hours earlier—having immediately obtained authorization from the Foreign Ministry and telephoned Anatoliy Muravyev—that we drove into the huge Soviets square. The impressive, marble-fronted CPSU obkom headquarters looks incongruous opposite the splendid church of the prophet Elijah and alongside the neoclassical building that houses the regional soviet. We were met also by Lyubov Serafimovna Plekhanovna, the Secretariat's ideologue, and by 3 of the 31 delegates that will represent the region's 117,000 members in Moscow. We asked to meet with members of the "initiative group" that organized the demonstration. Muravyev squirmed with embarrassment: "We could not trace them. We have no contacts with them." Really? "Actually we do know two of them—Ira Kovaleva, a designer, and Shkardiuk [name as published], who works at the Microelectronics Institute. Today is Saturday, however...." It is a pity: It would have been interesting to hear their opinion. However, our six hosts proved to be by no means reticent. Indeed they spoke freely, sometimes almost impulsively, as though freed from a burden or under the effect of a shock.

Did you expect to see thousands of people in the streets demanding glasnost, honest candidates, more restructuring? What has gone wrong? Lyubov Serafimovna—a Secretariat member for the past 2 years, married with an 18-year-old daughter—tried to parry the blow. "We expected the debate to become more animated but did not expect a demonstration."

Muravyev, who went to the square to face the protesters and who received his share of whistles, came straight to the point: "Officially, all we did was implement the Central Committee's guidelines. It was all in order. Basically, however, our democratic procedure left much to be desired." "Yes, indeed, we are still learning democracy," delegate Yevgeniy Zayezhnikov, a factory manager, commented.

This is what happened: The party grassroots organizations put forward a total of 157 candidates—one each. Then the raykoms made an initial selection, preferring candidates from the stronger organizations. Last, the oblast Secretariat made the final choice and submitted it to the plenum. It was all done scrupulously. Thousands of communists and citizens felt excluded, however. Even the 101 members of the plenum balked at the list. At the meeting, some very vigorous challenges were made, several candidates had to answer criticisms, and eventually in the secret ballot, only 7 of the 31 were approved, thanks to varying numbers of cancellations. This was the case even with Valentina Tereshkova, the first woman cosmonaut and deputy to the Supreme Soviet, put forward by the central party leadership. Many people's sights, however, were trained on Fedor Loshchenko, former oblast first secretary, Central Committee member, now promoted to the rank of minister.

People regard him as primarily responsible for the agricultural disaster in these "non-Chernozem lands" of the golden circle, cradle of ancient Russia.

"They whistled at me," Muravyev said calmly, "because they wanted to hear only one thing from me, namely, that we will remove Loshchenko from the list of delegates. I could not do this, however. His name was submitted to us by the Central Committee." The others remained silent. It was very apparent that nobody wanted to defend that name. Muravyev continued: "Of course, Loshchenko has his share of responsibility. But whom are we to blame for the chain of industrial developments, the exodus from the countryside, and the disastrous economic effects? Should we blame them all on Loshchenko? All these decisions were made by the Central Committee. In fact, we are all a little to blame."

People also want glasnost in connection with the privileges that you enjoy. It is true that you have special stores? Lyubov Serafimovna smiled complacently: "We do not have special stores...." Muravyev said: "We do have a hospital...." Only for you members of the apparatus? The ideologist produced a sheet of paper from his drawer: "Look, it is not only for the 100 apparatus officials. The hospital serves some 3,000 people, from soviet officials to party raykom officials, from party veterans to journalists and military commanders." Just 3,000 people—that is, the leadership sector. What about the rest? "Anyone needing specialist treatment can receive it at other centers," the ideologist replied confidently. This is qualified glasnost. The protesters disagreed. Perhaps Lyubov Serafimovna still has to learn the lesson that Muravyev already seems to have learned.

The delegates spoke next. Yevgeniy Zayezhnikov: "We have become separated from people. How is this to be remedied? People will tell us how...." Nina Saborova, a tire factory worker: "The more the leaders meet with people, the better." Yuriy Vasenkin, railroad engineer: "We must accustom ourselves again to demonstrations and, in fact, we, as a party, must promote them in order

to mobilize everyone's energies." It is clear that these three delegates will vote at the conference for more intensive restructuring. Will the "lesson of Yaroslavl" have any impact on future attitudes, however? Everyone is agreed on this: New methods must be established for electing both party leaders and soviets. According to Muravyev, "It is the people, members, who must say who is to lead the party." Kalinin added: "They must be able to make an informed choice among several candidates." Perhaps through a kind of referendum? "Why not? We have already sent proposals to the Central Committee. I believe we should implement new democratic methods starting with the next party and soviet elections."

What did they have to say about the proposal to elect the state president by universal suffrage? Even Lyubov Serafimovna considers it "interesting." What about the issue of a maximum two terms in office for all leaders at every level, as envisaged by the conference theses? The party is entirely agreed on this, too: "Only two and no more," the factory manager interrupted. When should this start: "According to practice, the congress should decide, but if the conference reaches this conclusion, why wait?" Muravyev commented wryly: "If we started right away, we would have to go...."

In the canteen, occupied by a number of party sector chiefs—on duty even on Saturday—the leaders nudged one another. This is a "privilege." Will it be abolished? "We will not starve to death...." Our conversation turned to the press. Kalinin acts as a sort of press watchdog but assured me that "We give advice to journalists only on political and ideological matters. And do you know what happens? People telephone me to ask whether anything really has changed or whether things are still as they were in the past. They find it difficult to believe that the party no longer has to deal with everything...." They say that a "revolution" is currently taking place in people's minds.

We left Yaroslavl without having succeeded in meeting with the youngsters supporting restructuring. Where were they? Down there on the sandy shores where the Kotorosl flows into the Volga? Perhaps along the green avenues where the local government building stands? Or outside the first Russian national theater? We did not meet with them, but from what we heard at the obkom headquarters, it was as though we had spoken with them.

Ways To Enhance Supreme Soviet Role Suggested

PM1406112588 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
13 Jun 88 Second Edition p 3

[M. Buzhkevich and A. Chernyak article under the rubric "Debating Tribune: Discussing the CPSU Central Committee Theses": "Full Power. Reflections on Ways To Radically Enhance the USSR Supreme Soviet's Role"—boldface as published]

[Text] It was just a coincidence: The newspapers simultaneously published reports on the just concluded USSR Supreme Soviet session and the CPSU Central Committee Theses for the 19th all-union party conference. Much space in them is devoted to strengthening the role of soviets of people's deputies at all levels, and they speak of the need to restore real power to the soviets. This also presupposes a radical enhancement of the role of the country's supreme organ of power. It was from this viewpoint that we decided to review the last USSR Supreme Soviet session and describe conversations with its deputies.

...On the day before the USSR Supreme Soviet session opened, Central Television conducted a poll in Moscow's streets to find out what people knew about the forthcoming sittings of the USSR Supreme Soviet. Some of those polled showed no interest at all in the event and did not know what questions would be discussed by the country's parliament. Why such a lack of interest in it? One of those who were asked this question explained: "Had it been a party Central Committee plenum, everyone would have been interested—it is there that the most important decisions on the country's and society's life are made. But a USSR Supreme Soviet session? What decisions does it make?"

It is sad to admit, but far from all Soviet people recognize the USSR Supreme Soviet as the supreme organ of state power, as enshrined in our Constitution. To this day, the parliament's work contains much formalism and many "ossified" traditions. PRAVDA's readers write about this, the deputies themselves say it.

"Sessions," according to poet Rasul Gamzatov, "still 'roll along' the well-trodden path. We arrive in Moscow, we get to the Kremlin, and we examine questions that have been prepared by the apparatus and have been essentially decided in advance."

"And our vote is invariably unanimous," Dzhemma Skulme, chairman of the Latvian Artists Union, added. "It would be interesting to find out whether anyone has ever thought about the cost to the people of our trips to the capital for this totally unnecessary unanimity. Even comrades-in-arms who are united by a single goal may have differing views on the ways to attain this goal, there must be arguments about how to find the best possible way. It is well known that truth is born out of argument. As for us, every now and again you hear it said at the session's sittings: 'All those in favor? Anyone against? None. Any abstentions? None.' Everything is nice, smooth, and calm. We are so accustomed to all this that at the last session, when I abstained during the vote on one of the proposals, the chairman paid no attention to my raised hand and right away summed it up as usual: 'Carried unanimously.' A triviality, some people might say. But here we have a matter of principle—to express one's own opinion, one's own belief. And this is where we deputies must set an example, a model to those who have elected us. It is incumbent upon us to actively influence the state's life and people's social mood, and this cannot be done by mechanical voting and formal unanimity."

"I am amazed by the haste at sessions," Ye. Safonov, general director of the "Nizhnevolzhskgeologiya" Association, told us. "The Law on the Cooperative System was, for all intents and purposes, discussed for only a few hours at just one sitting of the chambers. Only 23 deputies spoke. And yet this is something new, there are many unclarities and ambiguities. Everything ought to be thought out, right down to the tiniest detail. Even 2-3 days would not have been begrudged. I think that sessions ought to be convened more often—even once every quarter...."

V.I. Lenin also expressed a similar idea in the past. In his report to the 11th Russian Communist Party (Bolsheviks) Congress he noted that the aim must be to ensure that the All-Russian Central Executive Committee functions more energetically and that it is properly convened in sessions that should last longer.

At this point it would be appropriate to say that the majority of USSR Supreme Soviet deputies no longer wish to work in the old fashion and are breaking down the entrenched canons. The last session saw what could be described as an unprecedented event: Despite the agenda, the approval of the Law on the Cooperative System was postponed until the following day. Why? Numerous amendments were introduced during the discussion of the draft, and there was not sufficient time to consider them.

There were especially heated debates between the authors of amendments and government spokesmen, especially USSR Minister of Finance B. Gostev. V. Kalashnikov, secretary of the Volgograd CPSU Obkom, and Kolkhoz Chairmen V. Popov and F. Shnayder insisted that the new law contains a paragraph raising the minimum pension of kolkhoz members to the level of workers' minimum pension. The argument between the deputies and the head of the finance department lasted more than 1 hour. The minister was as immovable as a rock and did not yield: At present, he said, there is no money for such a step. This proposal, which restores social justice, will be included in the draft of a new law on pensions that is due to be submitted for nationwide discussion toward the end of this year. Let us add our own remark: According to the session's decision, the USSR Law on the Cooperative System will come into force 1 July this year, while the new pension provisions will not come into force before 1990. Many kolkhoz members will receive meager pensions for at least 1 and 1/2 years.

The list of documents ratified by the session omits the decree dated 14 March this year on the taxation of the income of citizens working in cooperatives. The progressive taxation of cooperative members gave rise to numerous complaints because it essentially ties their hands. It was decided to study this problem further. A commission was set up, headed by the USSR minister of finance. Deputies suggested that B. Gostev should inform the public of the new edition of the decree prior to its adoption by the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium.

Such debates during a session were virtually unheard of in the past. Let us hope that henceforth they will become the norm of our parliament's work. All this, of course, generates joy and hope. But there are also some distressing facts. The progress of restructuring in the supreme organ of power is far from easy. Judge for yourselves.

The session discussed the question of the work of soviet and economic organs to ensure fulfillment of the program for housing, cultural, and consumer services construction in light of the 27th CPSU Congress decisions. A coreport on behalf of several commissions of both Supreme Soviet chambers was delivered by Deputy V. Zgurskiy, chairman of the Kiev Gorispolkom. No, he did not applaud the country's housing program, but spoke with alarm of its imperfections. First, because there is still no exhaustive and verified information on the technical condition of the existing housing stock. Second, there is no clear-cut definition of the family as a unit of account, and it is therefore impossible to define the quantity and type of apartments required. And finally, there is no clear idea of what an individual home ought to be like, of the standard of its comforts and amenities. And here is the "nail" which the deputy drove home: He said that in this case the government actions are based more on guesswork and instinct rather than on scientific calculations.

Could it have been a case of V. Zgurskiy confusing the session and misinforming his colleagues? A clear explanation could have been given primarily by the main speaker on this question—Deputy Yu. Batalin, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers and chairman of the USSR Gosstroy. He failed to do so, he kept silent. So what is the truth?

It must be said that deputies' speeches, especially at sittings of permanent commissions and even at the sessions themselves, have recently become noticeably sharper. Some speakers, however, just like in the past, use the country's foremost forum for all sorts of obeisances to leaders of ministries and departments and for various supplications. This was the tone used, for example, in many speeches in the Soviet of the Union during the discussion on ways to improve the construction of housing and of social and consumer services projects. Suddenly Deputy Ye. Maryakhina, leader of an integrated team from Sverdlovsk, demanded on behalf of the voters that leaders of machine building sectors and numerous design organizations comprehensively and effectively tackle the mechanization of construction work. Construction industry workers today still perform a lot of manual labor and operate according to the principle of "Grab as much as you can, you can always throw it away later."

Let us turn to V.I. Lenin again. Back in November 1919, Vladimir Ilich wrote in a note on the composition of the All-Russian Central Executive Committee, the supreme organ of state power at the time: "Not all people's commissars (including the chairman of the Council of People's Commissars) and deputy people's commissars should be included." He evidently feared that members of the Council of People's Commissars would start imposing their opinions and will on the All-Russian Central Executive Committee, which would be contrary to the Soviet Constitution. Lenin's note provided the basis for the resolution on the composition of the All-Russian Central Executive Committee, which was later adopted by a Russian Communist Party (Bolsheviks) Central Committee plenum.

This warning was subsequently discarded and forgotten. And now the office of union minister automatically gives the minister a mandate of a USSR Supreme Soviet deputy. The last elections to parliament, held in March 1984, saw the election of 12 deputy chairmen of the USSR Council of Ministers, 78 ministers, 27 chairmen of union republic councils of ministers and their deputies.... And so it happens that those who are accountable to the Supreme Soviet and whose duty it is to implement the laws it adopts, often influence the union parliament's decisions at its sessions and impose their will on the supreme organ of state power. Paradoxical and unacceptable. The CPSU Central Committee Theses correctly say that the situation must be changed: It is time to assert the genuine supremacy of soviets over executive organs. The time has come to establish that officials from management organs subordinate to a soviet cannot be its deputies. This rule must extend, subject to rare exceptions, also to members of the union government.

Of course, this does not mean that "rank and file" parliamentarians carry no responsibility. So far, their activeness has been clearly lagging behind life which is fast changing and renewing itself. Some cannot—and at times do not even know how to—exercise the rights vested in them. Take for example the deputy's question—a powerful means in the struggle to fulfill voters' mandates, the struggle against major shortcomings in the economy and the social sphere. The total number of such questions asked during the nine sessions of the country's current Supreme Soviet is...two. Maybe this is why some of the laws approved by the USSR Supreme Soviet "operate" at half strength. Like the Law on the State Enterprise, for example.

"It is almost an insult, we fought for it, and today it is, to all intents and purposes, skidding," according to V. Piskunov, general director of the "Yakutalmaz" Association. "Collectives have simply not gained any independence—the ministries have no intention of relinquishing their power, functionaries are essentially uncontrolled. Much can be done by the USSR Supreme Soviet in this regard. A number of this law's provisions should have been amended, amplified, or replaced at this very session. Look at the U.S. Congress. Laws there soon become cluttered with amendments."

"And why not say this from the session rostrum?" we asked the deputy.

"It could have been said from the rostrum. Unfortunately, not everyone who wishes to speak can get the floor, owing to the short duration of the session's work. Last fall I did some solid preparatory work, wanted to speak about all the most pressing matters, but got no opportunity to speak."

"As a matter of fact, representatives of national republics—how shall I put it..." P. Gilashvili, chairman of the Georgian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, paused for a moment's reflection and went on: "...are not all in a position to play an active part in the discussion of questions. According to custom, only Russian is spoken at the sessions. Yes, this is our state language. But some people can express their ideas more accurately in their native tongue. The headphones plugged into the armrest of every seat enable you to hear the speaker's speech in English [Editor's note: an earlier edition of this article carried in Moscow PRAVDA on 12 June at this point has additional phrase "or German"] translation, but there are no translation facilities from Georgian or Kazakh into Russian."

Supreme Soviet deputies, just like deputies to all other soviets, perform their duties as public work. It is, of course, very good that they are not detached from the people.

They live among the masses and are aware of their concerns. There is, however, another side to the coin. But let us hear what Margarita Vasilyevna Yuferova, operator at Novopolotsk's "Polimir" Association, has to say.

"The ecological situation in Novopolotsk has deteriorated in the last few years. The population demands that urgent measures be taken, that the installation of gas traps and other apparatus be speeded up. I have to travel to the ministry in Moscow to solve these questions so that I might succeed in fulfilling the voters' mandates by the end of my term next spring—I'm thinking of retiring on pension. Seeing that women in the chemical industry are entitled to do so at the age of 45."

Margarita Vasilyevna added with a sigh that, had she been released from her work duties for the duration of her term as deputy she would have managed to do a great deal more for her electoral okrug.

There is a lot of sense in what she said. Quite a few of Yuferova's colleagues share her view. Some support her totally, others believe that deputies to the country's Supreme Soviet could be released from their work duties for several months every year.

Some deputies spoke with a sense of grievance about the fact that some leaders treat them in a downright consumerist fashion, instructing them to intercede with central organs to meet their requirements for the delivery of equipment, allocation of additional funds for industrial construction, and so on. For this purpose, deputies follow instructions from local bosses and use their personal notepaper to write letters to ministers or to the USSR Gosplan and Gossnab. Or they might travel to Moscow or the republic capitals as professional "pushers." [This last paragraph is entirely omitted in 12 June version]

Voters and those whom they send to the Supreme Soviet are also perturbed by the following problem. V. Karpov, first secretary of the USSR Writers Union Board, spoke of it with utmost frankness at the session. He represents Rostov Oblast in the Soviet of Nationalities. He pays only flying visits to his voters, they do not find it easy to get to him, and there are about 250 such deputies who are permanent residents of Moscow in full-time employment there. They also visit their voters infrequently and are, to a considerable extent, detached from their daily concerns and needs. Deputies who are Soviet ambassadors to various countries are in an even more difficult position.

Letters received by PRAVDA also say that the time has come to radically restructure the election system itself. They must really become elections, in other words there must be an opportunity to elect the most deserving of several candidates. Moreover, each one of them must come out with his own work program. At the same time, there are proposals to reduce as much as possible the number of persons whose leadership positions predetermine their election to the USSR Supreme Soviet. This group now represents about 40 percent of deputies there.

There is an opinion that our parliament ought to be cut down in size—it is rather unwieldy. There is the question of a more clear-cut delineation of powers and the overcoming of the chambers' functional impersonality; of a proportion of deputies being elected directly from public organizations within our society's political system.

Restructuring is persistently knocking on the doors of our parliament. It is time for it to abandon the well-trodden path of decades-old traditions, rules, and regulations. And to take the broad highway of democratic transformations and maximum defense of the people's interests. Then the work of its deputies, permanent commissions, chambers, and sessions will provide tangible confirmation that full power has been restored to the soviets.

Election of Central Committee Members Urged

WA18120079 Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English No 20, 22-29 May 88 p 13

[Article by Yuriy Burtin under the rubric "Towards the 19th Party Conference": "Who's Who on the Central Committee"]

[Text] During the years of stagnation, any criticism of "certain flaws," no matter how pointed it was, even any constructive approaches in the press, always contained something morally ambiguous. Why? Because proposals to correct and improve the economic or socio-political systems inevitably smacked of complacency and officialdom, self-deception or fraud so long as they focused on isolated aspects rather than the system as a whole. By raising the question of the need for revolutionary transformations in society, perestroyka (though only making its first steps, and facing serious obstacles) has radically changed the situation. Any kind of criticism (if it is honest) concerning any social problem is permissible; any constructive approach is permissible. In fact, criticism without constructive suggestions isn't interesting any more.

Thus I'd like to express some specific ideas regarding our leading political institution—the Party.

Some people maintain that the only way to guarantee democracy is to have a multi-Party system. This conclusion would be indisputable if we had exhausted all the possibilities for democratization under a one-Party system. We have not. If we are serious about democratization, then the first thing is to evaluate the democracy of all components of the Party's current organizational structure and procedures. My concern here is the procedure for forming the highest Party bodies: the CPSU Central Committee and the CPSU Central Auditing Commission.

The CPSU Central Committee is the country's brain. Virtually the highest authority, it takes decisions that are binding for all and guides all aspects of society's life. As the regular reports in PRAVDA attest, the activities of the Central Committee do not affect Party members alone. They affect everyone equally—Communists and non-Party people. But who are these 400 or so people elected by the Party Congress to the highest echelon of the Party and state leadership? Most are known to us by name only and only after the Congress is over. The published list provides only last names plus first and middle initials. To find out who's who requires major research. Why? The press publishes not only the names but short biographies of each member of the USSR Supreme Soviet. Those biographies are then compiled in a single volume for each convocation. The absence of any comparable information about the Central Committee is especially striking when you consider that there are 3 to 4 times as many deputies to the Supreme Soviet as there are Members and Alternate Members of the Central Committee: a Member has several times the political influence of a deputy.

Though the Party Rules do not envisage this, new Members of the Central Committee have traditionally been elected at a closed session of the Congress. Why? Is it of no consequence to the people and the Party who is elected—by whom and why—to serve for five years on the Central Committee, the Central Committee which

will elect Members of the Politbureau and the Secretariat (including the General Secretary) of the CPSU Central Committee? Is it less important for us to know what was said at the Congress about each candidate than, say, what was said in the various speeches of welcome?

All this, including how the votes are distributed, is important. Why is such an important procedure (for the Party and all society) still beyond the bounds of glasnost and, thus, democratic control from below? In the past, when too much of our life was veiled in secrecy, that way of doing things allowed the top Party and state leadership to reproduce itself and keep a grip on the key posts. Nine out of ten people were promoted to the Central Committee based on the principle that if you were a USSR Minister, a First Secretary of a regional committee, or a CO of a military district, election to the Central Committee or at least the Central Auditing Commission (and simultaneously to the USSR Supreme Soviet—see IZVESTIYA, No 120, April 1988) was practically automatic.

Is this principle or procedure—which made Central Committee membership something like an honorary addendum to an official post—democratic? Does the Central Committee, as a collegium of top officials invested with all authority, correspond with the task of democratizing our social system? I think the answer is obvious: both principle and procedure are part of what we are trying to overcome today.

I would suggest the following proposals for discussion at the 19th Party Conference:

1. Elect the highest Party bodies at the open session of the Congress.

2. In addition to the names of those elected to the Central Committee and Central Auditing Commission, list at least where and in what capacity each new Member and Alternate Member works.

3. Elect the highest Party bodies as well as the lesser Party committees according to personal merit, not official posts.

I believe all this might substantially enhance the Party's prestige and dynamism as well as the stability of the Party leadership.

Moscow TV Views Upcoming Party Conference Tasks

LD1506192188 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1750 GMT 14 Jun 88

[From the "May I Have the Floor" program; report by Aleksandr Mikhailovich Adamovich, identified by caption as a writer]

[Text] [Begin Adamovich recording] I do not think that a single congress or a single plenum has been awaited with such tension and with such hope as the upcoming all-union party conference. Of course, there are serious reasons for this. Among numerous reasons for the anxiety I can see the following:

We are all witnesses of how the ministerial bureaucracy has not very skillfully buried economic reform, but has managed to paralyze and castrate it. By doing this it managed not simply to put brakes on our economy but, to a certain degree, to discredit the restructuring itself, because the bureaucracy has made it impossible for the restructuring to give our population the fruits that should already have been reaped. Thus, it has made it impossible to activate support for restructuring.

I think that there is also concern that the most conservative part of the party bureaucracy and the party apparatus will try to do the same thing to those decisions and hopes pinned on the all-union party conference. In any case, the symptomatic fear that the party conference will go far in transforming society's political structures is clearly perceptible, and work against such success is clearly already being carried out.

For example, with regard to what we are seeing virtually every day now—well, we see something strange. After all, the whole country is a country of readers; it is now a country of ardent readers—I'm thinking about newspapers and magazines. This country knows who are the leaders of glasnost and, in the end, of democracy along with the creative and journalistic intelligentsia, which together with the party provides ideological support for restructuring. There are very few of these people. Everybody knows them and everybody reads them. Almost none of them have been elected to the party conference, although they were unanimously elected by the collective.

Let us say Gavril Popov, our economist who is amazingly talented, bold, and principled, was elected. Let us say there were 49 people (?at the chemistry faculty) and 48 voted for him, yet he did not pass. A usual higher education establishment official got through but Gavril Popov was, at the party raykom level (?removed) from this chance to participate, speak, and respond in as a conference delegate at the conference itself. They did this to Popov, and literally yesterday they also did this to Yuriy Nikolayevich Afanasyev. He was nominated by the collective of the (?Archive Institute). This is a man without whom it is difficult to imagine the conference. Nevertheless, it was done in a very simple and crude way. The right was given to the chemical technology institute that nominated a female student, who will sit and listen, but will probably not be very useful to the conference.

The same thing was done to Korotich and Koryakin, two publicists who participate very actively especially in the ideological aspect of restructuring. And so, I can go on and name Fedorov, an eye operations expert, world-famous scientist, and mainly a philosopher—a philosopher of restructuring. We listen to him and we read him. He got through by one vote. The three people who were speaking at the raykom were actively speaking against him. I would like to hear them. I would like to understand their logic, the logic of their speeches. But there is

clearly only one logic: the desire to send to the conference people who will not actively support radical changes in the political structure for the benefit of the soviets, for the benefit of those organizations which stood at the head of the revolution and which were created by the revolution in order to lead the country.

Well, you do know what our local soviets are like now. We know it extremely well. You see, the most graphic evidence of complete paralysis of this organization of soviets over our long history is provided by the history of our Supreme Soviet.

After all, it is remarkable for its ludicrousness—it is a joke and a laughing stock! Since 1937 when the first Supreme Soviet was elected, not a single delegate and not a single participant of the Supreme Soviet has not abstained, not to mention voted against any decision. What does this mean, then? That starting from 1937 all proposals announced from the rostrum were "ideal", were they not? We know that they were not, otherwise we would not have ended up in the deadlock we have. And this in the first place certainly—I say—is evidence of the fact that the Supreme Soviet was not set up by accident in 1937. This fear of 1937 has been hanging over and continues to this day to hang over all of the Soviet activities. But the most evident is simply solving nothing.

So the ideas pronounced by Mikhail Sergeyvich, the ideas that will clearly be the main ones at the party conference, can only be implemented if genuine clerks of works [porab] of the restructuring get to the conference and not the conservative section of the apparatus, which is now clearly opposing the view of the Communists. In this lies a huge hope. After all, we now observe how actively the Communists oppose this, how they no longer consent to the role of puppets of the apparatus. And so, in all these cases I have mentioned of active, creative intelligentsia who were not admitted to the conference, the party organizations and the party grassroots levels have now appealed these cases.

After all, in our cinematography arts institute, a party meeting was held the day before yesterday, where the Communists from the institute stated clearly that they do not agree with the discrimination against small party organizations which simply are not given the opportunity to nominate their own delegates. Our institute nominated Andrey Noykin, who again is a man who is well known in restructuring. He forecast that the conservative forces would assemble, that they would be ready for an offensive, and that they would attack soon. And an article by Nina Andreyeva [author of a SOVETSKAYA RUSSIYA article questioning restructuring] appeared literally 2 weeks later. So, this is how sensitive he is to what is happening in our society and in restructuring. Our party organization nominated him as a delegate. However, it is clear, and I am absolutely convinced, that if the mechanism of pushing through people from a list of delegates works then of course he will not get through, just as all those others I spoke about did not.

Well, how does our population regard the situation that has come about in expectation of the party conference? It seems to me that too many people unfortunately use very mundane yardsticks to measure the successes or failures of restructuring—there is sugar, there is no sugar; there is vodka, vodka has disappeared; there is a threat of price increases. This is all very important, very important indeed, and it is important that restructuring really should show some economic results right away. But we know the reasons it has not shown any yet; I have talked about those reasons. It is all sabotage by our ministerial bureaucracy. But I think it very important for people to understand that if restructuring does not take place, then we will not simply return to stagnation. We will roll back very far indeed, perhaps to that comrade, the gravedigger of socialism, the gravedigger of democracy, and, in the literal sense the gravedigger of millions of people's lives.

And what is also particularly dangerous is that if restructuring really does not take place—and far too much depends upon the party conference—then the situation in the whole world will change abruptly in the direction of the cold war. How could there be any talk of some sort of disarmament then, of any sort of peace? I think mankind will once again feel itself on the edge of an abyss. The feelings of hope about our country and even affection for our country, which one notices meeting people abroad, will abruptly be replaced by a feeling of resentment, of being deceived again, or by a feeling of confrontation. To say nothing of what will happen in our country.

We will return to the Rashidov syndrome [Rashidovshchina] but reinforced, I think, by the Beriya syndrome [Beriyaovshchina] because during the Brezhnev era the Rashidov syndrome was pretty liberal. The clans at the top—Rashidov's, Kunayev's, and Brezhnev's clans—plundered the country, but sort of allowed it to be plundered at the grass-roots level as well. Everything will change abruptly: alongside the Rashidov syndrome, I think, the Beriya syndrome will emerge again if restructuring collapses, because the frightened bureaucratic apparatus will feel mercy for no one. And the fact that our country will slip into the abyss, that it will turn into a poorly developed country encircled with missiles—and that is nothing more than some sort of political monster—will be the most dangerous situation for the entire world.

I think people must understand this, and they must therefore react to the forthcoming party conference as an event concerning everyone, not just Communists. Our slogan—the people and the party are united—should take on some sort of graphic form at this time. The party should really see the people on the streets now, see the people supporting the line mapped out by the 27th congress, for which the most active and most progressive

part of our party is fighting. They must support it actively, because, as I read in the newspaper, if there is an attempt to go backward and, what is more, to foist who knows whom on us as leaders of the whole country, then the people will not stand by in silence I think, this would be a mistake, because it will be too late then.

One of the major events of recent days, I cannot but mention this as we see it on television every day, is the withdrawal of our troops from Afghanistan. The old way of thinking put the troops there; the new thinking is withdrawing them. The way we regard this and the conclusions we draw about the impermissibility of small wars today, and all the more so tomorrow, are very important. Even the way we receive our returning boys is important.

And another thing I would like to say, the final thing—it flashed through my mind that 300 of our prisoners of war are still there. I think we must talk about this, we must talk about our attitude to those boys, which should show whether we have changed or not. Or have we remained in the same positions as those about whom I was reading in KRASNAYA ZVEZDA—some Colonel Pilatov, no, Filatov, who suspected that there were 5 million POW's in World War II declared traitors. I think we must expiate our inhuman, Stalinist attitude to the victims of that war, our prisoners of war, with our attitude to these 300 boys who are being held in terrible torment, in terrible conditions of captivity.

I think that the energies of our public and state must go in that direction now, this is of fundamental importance. It concerns not just the lives, the rescuing of these boys, but it will also show whether we have really changed in some of the most important, moral qualities. [end recording]

[Unidentified announcer] And now, dear comrades, an epilogue to the broadcast. Certain changes have occurred since the program was recorded. A most important stage in preparations for the 19th all-union party conference, the election of delegates, has been completed in the country. A number of active participants in restructuring to whom Aleksandr Adamovich refers have been elected as delegates. In particular, Yuriy Nikolayevich Afanasyev was elected as a delegate at the plenum of the Moscow Gorkom. Vitaliy Alekseyevich Korotich, editor-in-chief of OGONEK magazine, has been elected a delegate to the conference from Kherson Obkom. As far as Gavril Kharitonovich Popov is concerned, the Moscow Gorkom buro asked the Leninskiy Party Raykom and the Moscow University Gorkom to return to the issue of candidates, and the decision to forward two candidates—Anatoliy Alekseyevich Logunov and Eduard Dmitriyevich Yershov—was endorsed unanimously at a session of the gorkom with the secretaries of party organizations of all participating faculties. The Moscow Gorkom Plenum chose them as delegates.

As PRAVDA has noted, we have not gotten by smoothly and without formalism. But it is gratifying that during the nomination and discussion of candidacies, so many active and authoritative champions of restructuring have emerged. One thing is clear—that not all those who are worthy of it could be elected. the number of delegates is limited, after all. Be that as it may, the election or nonelection of one or another comrade must not be turned into a subject of resentment and wounded pride. By and large, the majority of those who have been elected for the 19th all-union party conference are those who actively support the course of revolutionary renewal of society, and who will, at the conference itself, draft the program for the deepening of restructuring.

Paper Views Battle Against Bureaucracy

PM1506153388 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 9 Jun 88 Second Edition p 1

[Editorial: "The Bureaucrat Can Only Be Vanquished by Waging an Uncompromising Struggle Against Him"]

[Text] "If someone gets up in front of you and says 'Let's put an end to bureaucracy,' that is demagoguery. That is nonsense. We will be fighting bureaucracy for many years, and anyone who thinks otherwise is a fraud and a demagogue, because it will take hundreds of measures to combat bureaucracy..."

These words were spoken by V.I. Lenin almost 7 decades ago, when our country was losing blood from the wounds of war and was exhausted from dislocation, typhus, and the constant need to defend itself against enemies. Probably only a genius like Lenin could have discerned the face of yet another terrible enemy in those incredibly difficult, oppressive days—an enemy who had already begun to penetrate every pore of the young state apparatus. Ilich pointed out the enormous extent of this danger.

Lenin's uncompromising formula essentially determined the future strategy of the fight against bureaucracy. The present day—which is complicated and crucial in many respects—urgently requires every party member to take an active part in this battle. The bureaucrat of today is the bearer of conservatism, dogmatism, and stereotyped thinking, which have become a real brake on restructuring.

"Can we view the bureaucrat simply as the notorious figure of the shyster from the housing office or the official from the ministry who is caricatured beyond recognition?" hydraulic engineer G. Ivanov from Angarsk wrote to PRAVDA. "No, the bureaucracy is far more complex. It includes the official, the soviet worker, and sometimes the party worker, and people in the world of science. What is more, it even includes a certain category of workers! It includes everyone who has one unfailing quality in common: Conservatism and the ability to feign businesslike activity."

We could also add to this: Indifference, incompetence, a lack of a creative, inquiring mind, and a refusal to support someone else's initiative. These qualities do not germinate in the bureaucrat spontaneously. The absence of any real link between the labor process—"office"—and the results of work is the source of the thistle known as bureaucracy.

The bureaucrat has many faces. But he is always the same inside: He will never do anything to the detriment of his own personal interests—and for this reason he passes them off as state interests. Hence, for example, the "substantiation" of projects to divert northern rivers; the construction of enterprises on the shores of Baykal that are lethal to it; the long, fruitless existence of some scientific research institutes; the turbid flood of gray, shoddy goods; and the percentage mania in law enforcement organs, schools, and medical institutions. Hence also the undeserved orders, bonuses, and laureate titles...

"How can we get rid of all this more quickly?" Muscovite and old Communist B. Neshkovskiy asks.

That is the question of the moment.

The laws on the labor collective and the enterprise, the revival of Leninist principles of socialist democracy, election to office, a bold move toward self-management, broad glasnost, the development of cooperative forms of economic management... A whole arsenal of unusually powerful political, social, and economic measures has been implemented since April 1985. The task is now to learn how to use them and bring them together in one, unified mechanism. This will be the guarantee that the bureaucrat will lose his power.

The Ivanovo association is a typical example. Restructuring levers have made it possible to raise the monolith of the personal interest of all categories of workers and employees to the level of public interest. And this has made it possible for the association to penetrate the international market and, frankly speaking, feel at home there. The association believes that there is a direct link between its economic success and the atmosphere of democracy, glasnost, and open discussion of any problems.

It is Communists' direct responsibility to prevent this link from being broken and to prevent the bureaucrats from once again subordinating real action and common sense to "paperwork." The primary tasks are to introduce the principle of election, broaden glasnost, support innovators, and be guided by general state interests rather than departmental interests when resolving conflicts.

The bureaucrat is putting up perceptible resistance to restructuring trends. He is primarily trying to discredit the very idea of glasnost and democratization. He is doing his utmost to drag out the real solution of problems facing labor collectives and people living in cities and villages. He is smothering the initiative shown by people who have ventured to take out a patent or form a cooperative.

Thousands of proposals from the rationalizers, inventors, and nameless skilled people in whom our country has always been rich disappear from the desk of bureaucracy into its gluttonous maw. This inevitably leads to the stagnation of creativity.

It is the direct duty of party committees to destroy the musty atmosphere of secrecy. It is equally important to mercilessly smash the "formula of no connection" between the prosperity of bureaucrats of any rank and the fruits of their labor or the fruits of the labor of the collectives subordinate to them. The appearance of institutions for the democratization of society and the management of the country's economy, such as labor collective councils, for example, is beginning to make leaders accountable to the collective. But this has revealed yet another, qualitatively new environment inhabited by the bureaucracy—the possession of information. The new quality that has come to us with the scientific and technological revolution changes the bureaucrat's old weapon—formalism, red tape, and the refusal to make decisions—for a more subtle but possibly more powerful weapon. Information, in the form of thousands upon millions of separate units of technologically encoded knowledge and statistical data, represents the "sustenance" of the modern bureaucrat.

"I am sending you a model 'document.' Or, to be more precise, a model instance of mockery," A. Bogachev, a welder from the Kramatorsk No 5 Special Construction and Installation Administration, wrote. "To solve what I had thought was a trivial matter—filling out a travel expenses claim form—I had to collect the signatures of the administration chief and the work superintendent. For every return trip. This meant several dozen signatures every month! The sum of R8.80 is simply not worth this kind of effort and humiliation..."

Who introduced this complex, pointless reporting and why? But this is an extremely simple form of unnecessary information. In more delicate matters, the educated bureaucrat is capable of making changes in a computer memory and adjusting it to the benefit of departmental (read—ultimately personal) interest. But without accurate information neither real economic accountability, nor self-capitalization, nor the process of democratizing our life will make any headway...

Competence—this is what is now required of the economic and party worker.

...Since April 1985 we have regained our confidence in socialism's ability to eradicate bureaucratic distortion. The Leninist principles of combating bureaucracy have once again forged a path to us through the thickness of

time and the layers of the complex, contradictory, sometimes tragic periods in our history. And—once again!—these principles determine the landmarks in our future progress. Every party committee, every Communist, and all sincere champions of restructuring must measure their moral and political stand against these principles.

The bureaucrat basically has no philosophical standpoint. He passes off exclusively personal interest as this standpoint. The time demands that we lay bare the fundamental nature of the bureaucratic timeserver and make it vulnerable. The first steps in this direction have already been taken. The most important thing now is not to stop because the notion of stopping and restructuring are incompatible.

Social Impact of Brezhnev Era Pondered

PM1506100188 Moscow NEDELYA in Russian No 23, 6-12 Jun 88 (Signed to Press 8 Jun 88) pp 9, 10

[First part of Igor Bestuzhev-Lada article under the rubric "Toward the 19th All-Union Party Conference": "Triumphantly Marching Nowhere. L.I. Brezhnev and the Time of Stagnation"—boldface as published]

[Text] "...Working people's participation in the management of state and social affairs is becoming increasingly effective and increasingly important with each passing year. (Prolonged applause)"

"...It is our common duty to decisively struggle against bureaucratism and ostentation, to ensure that all personnel perceive serving the people as their main goal. (Prolonged applause)"

L.I. Brezhnev, 6 November 1964

"...Anyone who has lost the ability to critically appraise his activity, has lost touch with the masses, nurtures flatterers and toadies, and has lost the confidence of Communists cannot be a party leader. (Applause)"

L.I. Brezhnev, 24 February 1976

1. Urgent! Drop everything, and assemble this instant for a matter of paramount importance: the nomination of delegates for the 19th party conference.

Since, for understandable reasons, almost none of those assembled had any idea how to nominate delegates for an all-union party conference (the last one was held half-a-century ago), people went to the meeting with keen interest. Were they **themselves** really about to nominate delegates? Would it not be the same old story? Would the chairman not glance down at his notes and mutter: "Dear comrades, we have a proposal to nominate comrade so-and-so. Anyone against any abstentions. Carried unanimously..."?

Whom to nominate? **How** to nominate? The newspapers wrote that the "foremen of restructuring" ought to be nominated. But who among those who always vote unanimously for everything (including for restructuring) is to be deemed a "foreman"? Most probably they will first read out the instructions about who is a "foreman" and who is not. How do you manage without instructions? You don't know what to think, it is all so unfamiliar....

But those assembled were worrying in vain. Reality swiftly took the well-trodden path. True, the chairman, mindful of restructuring and the new thinking, first asked for appearances' sake: "What do you think, comrades?" As before, over the decades, the comrades did not have and could not have had any thoughts on the matter. Naturally, they all waited for someone, delegated in advance, to stand up with a piece of paper in his hand and falteringly read "his" ideas which had been written by someone else. Nobody stood up (that's what I call democratization!). There was nothing left for the chairman to do but to mutter the familiar "We have a proposal...."

Generally speaking, those who were nominated were probably no worse than anyone else inside the hall. They might even have been better. But the point is that they were nominated somewhere "at the top," while the candidates were simply "handed down" to the hall. And half a workday was wasted on this "automatic adoption"! But what was to be done? There were no grounds to reject anyone, because the candidates were hardly known to the meeting participants, and some were totally unknown to them. Put up someone of "their own" against the "outsider"? But there is just one candidate for several thousand members! What if everyone started pushing someone of "their own"....

Of course, if every organization had first nominated "its own person" (maybe even an "outsider," but their own nominee), and then the rayon had drawn up a list of those who had gained a majority of votes, supplied the required information on every candidate, and then held another ballot in the organizations—that would have been different: genuine democracy!

But all this is too much hassle, it is unfamiliar. Moreover, what if the "wrong person" is elected? Try and explain that to the "authorities"! Much more comfortable to decide the issue "at the top," in the quiet of the raykom office, and then hand it on "down." After all, they'll vote unanimously whatever you decide! And the event goes smoothly and is held on time, which is much more important than any democracy.

People dispersed, with wry smiles on their faces, trying not to look at each other. The "event" would formerly have been accepted as something to which there was no alternative. But now the press has been going on for weeks about "nomination," about "foremen," and so on. Yet a whiff of the recent past was back in the air. Most

probably, everyone thought to themselves: Yes, it is a bit too early to boast that we have restructured ourselves—many things, very many things, are just the way they were 10 years ago, under Brezhnev.

Brezhnevshchina.... Brezhnevshchina is alive and well in our country.

For more than 2 years our social awareness has been painfully elaborating an idea which initially seemed scandalous and even seditious but now, just a few weeks after the famous PRAVDA article, is becoming self-evident for a growing circle of people who either have seen or are beginning to see the light: It is necessary to distinguish between the history of the USSR peoples from the late twenties to early fifties (heroic, momentous, legendary, and at the same time acutely dramatic and in some respects even tragic) and Stalinism as an ideology contrary to Marxism-Leninism. Stalinism, in its turn, must be distinguished from **Stalinshchina**—the criminal political adventures, gross arbitrariness, flagrant illegality, mass unjustified repressions—in short, all the excesses and all the crimes committed on the basis of abuse of power and associated with attempts to implement Stalinism, the terrifying utopia (anti-utopia?) of barracks socialism.

Incidentally, in just the same way we are beginning to perceive that it is necessary to distinguish between the first (unsuccessful) attempted restructuring of Soviet society in the late fifties and early sixties, the restructuring of what was created by Stalin and what we now call the administrative edict system or bureaucratic centralism, and **Khrushchevshchina**, in other words the "willful" decisions at all levels of social management without relying on science or even on elementary common sense, decisions which were, so to speak, militantly utopian and suicidal for the rural and urban economy alike, as well as for the entire national economy. The ideology of this voluntarism had no time to emerge properly, and it is therefore hardly possible to speak of "Khrushchevism" in the same way that we speak of Stalinism. In our opinion, however, it is not only possible but also categorically necessary to study the ideological preconditions of Khrushchev's voluntarism.

Applying the same logic, it is obviously expedient to distinguish between our people's achievements between the late sixties and early eighties (including the three attempts to extricate ourselves from the morass created by the administrative edict system, in 1966-1969, 1979, and 1983) and **Brezhnevshchina**, in other words the mass demoralization of people in all strata of society, the mass thievery and drunkenness, the economy's decay, the gulf between word and deed, the mass sloppiness and servility, the complacency and duplicity—in short, the social freeloading, social hypocrisy, and social obsequiousness, according to Lenin's definition of the term (see Vol 26, p 108).

As in the previous case, there are no grounds for talking of "Brezhnevism" as some sort of special ideology or theory of this kind of social practice—simply because of the particular features of that practice.

As a matter of fact, Brezhnevshchina is the same old "cult" (which began to be quietly revived even by Khrushchev, back in 1957) but, as usually happens in history, in the form of a shameful farce rather than a national tragedy. A certain journalist was correct in describing it as "the bloodless cult."

However, how can I put it.... There were again adventures, arbitrariness, illegalities, and groundless repressions—even though the numbers did not run into millions like before, but "only" into thousands. This did not make it any easier for the victims. And the millions who saw the impunity of arbitrariness experienced a revival of the fear instilled into people's flesh and blood by the "bloody cult," and their personalities degenerated.

In short, the ultimate result in general was almost identical. The same old Stalinshchina, the only difference being that it had become decrepit, dozing in a comfortable armchair, and had begun to putrefy while still alive, as it were, together with the country's economy and culture.

Brezhnevshchina did not emerge suddenly, it did not arise right away in the fall of 1964, when the leadership circles deemed it impossible to tolerate any longer the top leader's voluntarism, which was fraught with unpredictable consequences for the country as a whole and for each member of the leadership individually. The new leadership came to power beneath slogans of the scientific substantiation of society's management and economic reform aimed at ending the defects of the administrative edict system, which were obvious even at that time.

And in 1964 the new top leader was marked neither by the Macbeth-like villainy of his predecessor but one, nor by the Manilov-like impulsiveness of his immediate predecessor. He was a typical obkom secretary of the period—no better and no worse than any of his 200-300 colleagues who virtually ruled the country at the time. But since the sociopolitical conditions had remained the same (bureaucratic centralism), the consequences they produced were also the same and, ultimately, produced the universally known results.

Maybe Konstantin Simonov's diagnosis is correct: The disintegration of personality, inevitable in conditions of total servility, took one form under Stalin and another form under Brezhnev?

Yes, Brezhnev was clever enough to put up some resistance, not to disgrace himself by renaming cities as countless "Brezhnevgrads" while he was still alive—although no more than a hint would have been sufficient for the lackeys to rush to rename even rivers and seas.

But man is weak! How can you possibly offend people who seemingly love you boundlessly, who offer "convincing" proof that you have long deserved a Hero's star—this one and that one, and another one, and another, and another.... That "the people will simply not catch on" if, out of the blue, you don a marshal's uniform and pin on it the Order of Victory, awarded for victory in a war **won under your leadership,** even though during that war you were an ordinary political officer like thousands of others. Why offend people who, with shouts of greeting, send you gifts by the truckload, presenting you with your 20th Mercedes, a diamond ring worth tens of thousands of rubles, or something else equally pleasing to behold?...

What is so special about all this, you might say? Bringing joy to a respected person in his old age.... But did it never occur to you that you had been offered a "pebble" which, in the lower echelons of power, would turn into a downright "landslide" of abuses and embezzlement, careerism and protectionism. That you would have to close your eyes, already half-blinded by the glitter of the gifts, so as not to see the various "tricks" of the givers. That ultimately you would become a star-studded toy in the hands of some very mercenary people, some intellectually and morally degraded people, people shortsighted in everything that did not smack of profit—starting with greedy members of your household and ending with an even greedier minister of internal affairs.

But the main point was that a blind eye was turned to the fact that the economy was becoming unmanageable and was even, strange and terrible to say, turning into a "black" economy. That social life was being replaced by ostentatious verbiage. That all subsystems of public education, from elementary school to VUZ, were collapsing. That all cultural institutions—from press, radio, and television right through to theater and cinematography—were, like galaxies, "zooming away" from their audiences at cosmic speeds. That the family on a statewide scale was suffering from "disintegration." That health care was turning into "health destruction." That "the unnatural concentration of gigantic masses in large cities" (V.I. Lenin, Vol 26, p 74) was growing and that the countryside, and agriculture with it, were becoming proportionately degraded. That the "classified" dynamics of crime looked increasingly alarming. That drunkenness was becoming general and baneful for society's very continued existence.

It was not difficult to guess that all the aforementioned processes and others like them could not have continued forever, or even for more than 1-2 decades. The pressing problems would inevitably develop into crises and ultimately into disasters. The verge of crisis! The threshold of disaster! But.... The latest "victories" were hurriedly reported on the occasion of the presentation of the latest "star." And if anyone did manage to see through it all, he was forced to keep silent because the main rule of the game, as everyone well knew, was "not to stick out" so as not to spoil the picture of ostentatious general prosperity and covert private prosperity.

2. Presumably in the foreseeable future historians, economists, sociologists, psychologists, and jurists will thoroughly analyze what was happening, and what did happen in our country between the sixties and the early eighties. Who brought the country to the precrisis situation from which we are now finding it so difficult to extricate ourselves, how, and why? Who, apart from Brezhnev, is personally responsible for this, and what were the real alternatives for a more favorable social development?

I would like to draw the reader's attention to just one aspect of Brezhnevshchina—the effect it had on society's moral atmosphere, the effect it had on our moral character—yours and mine. Both yesterday and, out of inertia, today. I think that this is as important as any other aspect of the sociohistorical phenomenon under examination. First of all it is a matter of social freeloading.

Let us take a simple example: Price formation, meat prices, say. Is it impossible to sharply increase meat production within a short time and simultaneously considerably reduce its prime cost? Actual experience in the past few years proves: It is possible, provided this work is approached in a constructive rather than a consumerist fashion.

It appears that to achieve this we need "merely" switch the...stockmen themselves to "free range" conditions. We need only stop hindering their work and, as we have read and seen on television, a dozen "Arkhangelsk muzhiks" are capable of producing more (and better!) output than a vast sovkhoz with thousands of workers and hundreds of managers.

The picture is more or less the same in crop farming. What if the vast apparatus of Agroprom functionaries, which often stifles workers' initiative with its traditional administration by decree, were to be restructured into small task forces of specialists **serving** the current needs of crop farmers and stockmen (with an equally small central staff to coordinate this essentially new services sphere)? What if we at long last implement Lenin's behest "Do not dare command the peasant," which now clearly applies to raykoms, obkoms, rayispolkoms, and oblispolkoms? Maybe then the price formation of agricultural products would take a different form?

In general, as the press has remarked, our departments act with lamentable uniformity on questions of price formation: They unleash one price race after another. It is not hard to see that this is a predatory approach, it is social freeloading. And when it comes to foodstuffs, the approach must obviously be qualitatively different: We must work out how much we produce of everything, calculate what this is "per capita," relate this quantity to

the minimum family budget, and set the price of foodstuffs at a level whereby the "low paid" do not suffer. This logic has been repeatedly (but hitherto in vain) suggested by various writers.

A second example. There are data indicating that one-fourth of the 131.5 million jobs in our national economy fall within the category of so-called "surplus jobs." This means that approximately 32 million persons constitute "surplus manpower" (not counting another few million able-bodied men who do not work and women who do not have the burden of children).

No, the "surplus" people are not unemployed. They work like everybody else, but there are four of them where there is not even enough work for three—with corresponding wage payments to each of them. The "surplus" is particularly large in the management sphere, which, as everyone knows, employs up to 18 million people—one in seven! But other spheres also have plenty of "surplus staff": Every director and chief recruits as many people as possible—one is absent, another one has asked for time off, the next seven have been sent to the kolkhoz or the vegetable base, but the plan must be fulfilled. And so they recruit them "just in case"—after all, the wages don't come out of their own pockets!

On the other hand, the past few years have seen the accumulation of artificially created "manpower shortages," running into at least 15 million jobs. Where? In the most crucial sectors of production, where the national economy cannot function without the necessary workers. There is a shortage of machine tool operators (even with one-shift working, we have 60 people per 100 machine tools, but there ought to be three-shift working), drivers (one vehicle in five stands idle in many motor vehicle pools for this reason), tractor drivers and machine operators, construction industry workers, milkmaids, and others.

Common sense indicates: Switch even one-half of the "surplus" people to the areas where there are "shortages," and all will be resolved. As a matter of fact, this is what we have done by planning to retrain 16 million "surplus workers" by the year 2000, with 3 million to be retrained by 1990, and to transfer them to areas where there are "manpower shortages," to the sphere of either cooperative or individual labor activity, or to pension them off (with abolition of the corresponding sinecures). For understandable reasons, however, this prospect makes few people enthusiastic. This is where we have to overcome social freeloading and take a civic-minded, constructive stance!

The aforementioned imbalance is one of the gravest legacies of Brezhnevshchina. And it has grown year by year, since the traditional orientation of our secondary school graduates toward VUZ enrollment has ultimately produced more and more deskbound sinecures, while the retirement of skilled workers on pension created more and more "vacancies" in places where it is impossible to manage without workers.

What is to be done? People with the mentality of Romans from the time of that great city's decline have just one answer to this question: You do what you like, my kids will sit behind a desk, perform on the stage or in the stadium, and if the worst comes to the worst they can man a synchrophasotron. It doesn't matter that they are not talented—I have connections. It doesn't matter if the pay is low—I'll subsidize my kids from my own pension. It used to be: After me, the deluge. Now it is: Let there be a deluge around me and my family, as long as we are standing on high ground.

It is clear that this mentality will not take you very far. In terms of the number of staff chiefs, assessors, engineers, physicians, scientific workers, painters, artists, writers, and poets per capita, we have already surpassed all countries in the world. One could, of course, imagine that within a few years, given these trends last, one-half of us will be crowding the stages (with auditoriums as empty as ever), the other half will be standing in line at the cash desk of scientific research institutes, and we will get our potatoes from Cuba, our meat from Argentina, our grain from the United States, our shoes from Italy, our boots from Austria, our suits from Monsieur Cardin, and so on. But how realistic is this?

The key to the solution of the problem—provided it is approached in a constructive rather than a freeloading fashion—lies...in our children's hands. Not only are they more or less capable in general, but they also have qualitatively different abilities. Most of them are not capable of completing their secondary school education in its present, VUZ-oriented form. So what? We must create different types of secondary schools geared to the abilities of the main groups of pupils—so that their studies are more interesting and schools train not "surplus" manpower but the production workers who are "in short supply" and will certainly be needed over the few decades of the foreseeable future.

The third example is our social activeness. Or rather passiveness. Just look at one of our typical meetings—even meetings which discuss questions that are important for everyone. The expression on all faces is one and the same: Oh God, let them finish their speeches quickly and let us go home, to our beloved television sets. True, this tradition developed not through our ill will but because of the very nature of the meetings themselves.

Sometimes a discussion will get quite heated. At times excessively heated, displaying God knows what heights of debating standards. Passions (verbal) reach fever pitch. But as soon as it comes to the question of how to implement the resolution, everyone disappears home.

Well, if we behave like weak-willed children, leaving the solution of our problems to uncles from the outside, why complain if one of our "guardians" starts abusing his position and ordering us about?

NOVYY MIR Editor on Impact of Glasnost

PM1606090488 Rome LA REPUBBLICA in Italian 11 Jun 88 p 24

[Interview with NOVYY MIR Editor Sergey Zalygin by Paolo Garimberti in Milan; date not given]

[Excerpt] Milan—[Introductory passage omitted] We began, naturally, by discussing Selyunin's article on Lenin—over 100 pages long—which argues the theory, now well established among Western historians, including communists, that Lenin was, especially between 1920 and 1924, a contradictory and tragic figure, a natural child. Such a theory, expounded in a Soviet newspaper, is tantamount to removing part of Lenin's remains from his shrine in the Red Square mausoleum. What was the purpose of that article? I asked. Who ordered it?

"Nobody," Zalygin replied. "It was ordered only by this (he tapped his head three times with the second and third fingers of his left hand.) You ask me about its purpose. That is simple—to give an objective account of a particular period of history. You say Lenin was a contradictory figure. No revolutionary can adhere to a single idea. Revolution is not dogma because life is not dogma. This is how it was with Lenin. He made certain political calculations: He was counting on a revolution in Germany; he believed that the October Revolution could be bloodless; he was sure that the civil war could end in 1918. All these calculations were mistaken. New decisions were made that caused certain developments. This is how the foundations of the personality cult were laid."

[Garimberti] Mr Zalygin, you tell me that such an article was not discussed "at the top" and that you decided to publish it yourself. If you will permit me to say so, either you are seeking self-destruction, or newspaper editors in the USSR now enjoy extraordinary freedom, or the historical and political debate is so confused that anything can happen—even vicious attacks on Lenin's pedestal.

[Zalygin] This article made a very major impact and caused a sensation here in the West. Not in our country. It was interpreted as a further step toward a more objective assessment of our history. I did not receive any criticism for it, even from readers. Nobody told me that we are toppling Lenin from his pedestal, as you put it. So I do not consider myself self-destructive nor do I believe I am running any risks.

[Garimberti] Tvardovskiy, whom you regard as your master, conducted political activity by publishing banned authors. You go beyond this and publish not only banned poets and authors but also socioeconomic studies such as Shmelev's or historical studies such as Selyunin's that would once have been defined as counterrevolutionary. Does this mean that Gorbachev's restructuring is much more thorough than Khrushchev's and that it demands more explicit statements and much more direct messages than merely literary ones?

[Zalygin] Certainly. Khrushchev merely wanted to improve the established system. Yes, he too considered reforms but they were what could be called merely administrative reforms that did not profoundly affect Soviet social structure or political democracy. Gorbachev's blueprint is much more far-reaching: It affects society, democracy, foreign policy, our historical heritage, economic structure. So, to return to the comparison with Tvardovskiy that you suggest, I would say that yesterday's literature is no longer enough to resolve today's problems.

[Garimberti] So is the political struggle also much tougher than it was then?

[Zalygin] Of course, because the reforms that we are aiming at are much more thorough.

[Garimberti] Do you believe you will succeed?

[Zalygin] I never think about the results. For me the important thing is to know what must be done. It is a matter of awareness. Therefore I regard it not in terms of success or failure but in terms of moral duty. The outcome of major revolutions are always unpredictable. I do know, however, that we have no alternatives, no other solutions. I will just tell you this: If some day there are only a dozen advocates of restructuring left, I will be among them.

[Garimberti] You maintain that in past years the failure to publish many literary works was due not to political reasons but to the absence of clear ideas about people's demands. Do you mean that Soviet society has changed faster than its leadership class, including the heads of its publishing houses? Does it also mean that Gorbachev is no accident but the reflection of a changed society?

[Zalygin] Precisely. If it had not been Gorbachev it would have been someone else, but the reforms were unavoidable. You see, it is difficult for me to imagine what would have happened if we had been forced to coexist with the previous regime for another 2-3 years. Our country had already exceeded the limits within which a normal existence is possible. It was living outside normality, beyond the danger threshold.

[Garimberti] Mr Zalygin, I lived in Moscow during the Brezhnev era, which is now described as "the period of stagnation." There was an attempt at economic reform, whose principles were similar to those of the present reform, and there was detente with the United States, as is the case now. Do you not consider it excessive and also

too easy to blame Brezhnevism for all the present troubles? Is this not a way of avoiding the real problem, namely, the defects of the system?

[Zalygin] I do not regard the period of stagnation as an abstract phenomenon or as isolated from the past. Indeed it must be examined against the backdrop of the past. The worst mistake of the Brezhnev period was precisely the failure to seek a critical understanding of the past. There was never an attempt to examine our heritage critically because the rule of the Brezhnev years was silence. Therefore no escape valves were created for all the negative legacy burdening the system. Perhaps people thought they were happier in past years, and perhaps they were better off economically. Let me explain with a metaphor. In Latvia butter is made at home by putting a piece of rancid butter into the milk; you churn it, let it settle, and the butter is formed. Now there is no longer any milk and not yet any butter.

[Garimberti] You won a major environmental battle with ministerial bureaucracy by halting the Siberian river diversion project. You did so with readers' assistance. Do you believe that there is becoming established in the Soviet Union a body of public opinion that wants to be taken into account and to influence political decisions?

[Zalygin] I could reply with the same story about the butter. Everyone talks about everything now but there are few results to be seen. When this tide of criticism began the bureaucrats were frightened at first. Then they realized that their salvation lay precisely in the continuation of the debate: As long as discussions continue, without anything being decided, bureaucrats are free to carry on with their own business.

[Garimberti] Tvardovskiy published Solzhenitsyn in NOVYY MIR. Do you intend to publish him again?

[Zalygin] I cannot rule it out. There are works that deserve to be published.

[Garimberti] Which?

[Zalygin] I would start with those that Tvardovskiy considered for publication, which then failed to materialize—"Cancer Ward," "The First Circle." Then we shall see.

'Bukharin Club' Activities Reported

PM1406091988 Moscow SOVETSKAYA KULTURA in Russian 7 Jun 88 p 6

[Article by "our special correspondent" Ye. Illesh: "In the Former City of Brezhnev... 'If We Say That the New Cities Are the Model of a Socialist Way of Life, Then the City of Brezhnev Is the Best Example of It' (Current Affairs Writing From the Beginning of the Eighties)"—boldface as published]

[Text] Nabereznyye Chelny—**The name Brezhnev had to be abandoned. It was not a city, it was a social monstrosity." (The opinion of an inhabitant of Naberezhnyye Chelny).**

Size for the sake of size, that is to say, the conviction that big is beautiful, is not just the enshrining in town-planning of the smug monumentalism of a system that exercises control from top to bottom but also confirmation of the city-dweller's insignificance and dependence. The plan then incorporates a street two runways wide along which an exultant throng of banner-waving demonstrators may comfortably process but which no one has any desire to stroll along. The distance between apartment blocks will be calculated not with with a woman hurriedly pushing a baby carriage to the baker's in mind but in terms of how well the vast slogans on neighboring roofs can be seen. And the party gorkom building is, of course, very big and surrounded by a giant square.

And is it so important that no living thing can be found on this square and that anyone wanting to feel beneath his feet the biggest manmade square in Europe costing millions is knocked over by a ferocious wind that blows all year round. It is possible that the millions would have been enough to build the schools the city needs—the provision of school places is 25 percent below requirements. Kindergartens have been built for only 61 percent of children and polyclinics for only half. The enormous, deserted gorkom building could make up at least in part for the shortage of space for trade or other equally necessary activities.

This (young!) half-million-strong city has only three movie theaters, and no matter how we drive teenagers out of basements and hallways, there is nowhere else for them to go. (There was a growth in juvenile crime of around 16 percent in 1987 compared with the previous year). And the host of children badly controlled by their school is growing, even if the number of maternity homes is insufficient. How was it not possible to anticipate this demographic individual activity in what was, I repeat, a new city? Whose job was it, then, to do so?

"Do you not find it hard, Rais Belyayev, being responsible for everyone who is happy, laughs, cries, or sings outside these windows?" (From a current affairs article of the early eighties, republished, by the way, in 1987).

"Belyayev and Gilyazov are currently being investigated over a case of particularly large-scale embezzlement" (SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA, 15 and 16 April 1988). R. Belyayev was former first secretary of the Brezhnev party gorkom and then secretary of the Tatar party obkom, and R. Gilyazov, former chairman of the Brezhnev Gorispolkom. No doubt when being regaled at their table you could not help but think: "These Chelny people set a real example of how the Food Program should be carried out in practice..."

When the incredulous citizens who had gone to sleep in Naberezhnyye Chelny and woken up in Brezhnev were obliged to "express approval" of the rapid change of name after the event, many put up with it in the naive hope that, along with the capital title, the Moscow

supplies with which the first construction workers were pampered would resume. They did not. As of old, housewives take crumpled food coupons out of their purses and the constant smell of canned fish greets children at the kindergarten.

This city—the "favorite" of the Brezhnev era—did not just absorb the contradictions and problems common to the whole country, it gave them a particular refinement and edge, even just externally. And it would have been odd to imagine that this would not be noticed by those whose youthful enthusiasm and "Komsomol fervor" were exploited on thousands of Saturdays spent doing voluntary work, which turned effortlessly into unpaid Sundays, to the accompaniment of empty promises of blessings soon to come (8,000 people are currently on the apartment waiting-list).

Social apathy and indifference born of lack of belief or making an attempt to understand what kind of world you have found yourself in and why? Not a big choice. And 5 years ago it was made by some young inhabitants of the "city of the future," who created their own political club.

"I contend that no thinking person can remain outside politics"—N. Bukharin.

Is it an unexpected paradox or, if you have in mind the social background, an inevitability, that the scientific and practical conference entitled "N.I. Bukharin and His Role in the History of Soviet Society," timed to coincide with the 50th anniversary of his execution and the 100th anniversary of his birth, was not held anywhere in the capital or in a university lecture hall but in a young people's political club in Naberezhnyye Chelny? Perhaps professional historians are preparing for future lectures, discussions, and conferences, possibly they are waiting for some kind of official signal to start holding them. Be that as it may, a conference took place right here, in Naberezhnyye Chelny, in March this year.

To be able to evaluate the work of the independent historians, economists, and political experts you must at least have read Bukharin's books and know the sources not from the official account supplied by the textbooks but in the original and be in possession of a first-class diploma for at least some kind of independent research work on our history rather than for rote-learned formulas about blocs, deviations, and mistakes by the "enemies" of Leninism. And surely it is an absurdity on a historical scale that it was not a Soviet publication but a political biography of Bukharin by the U.S. researcher S. Cohen that should serve as the club members' textbook and manual. And it was from him rather than from an academic institute that the greetings telegram to the conference came.

"Academicians not engaged in research but constantly justifying their history to their society turned history into a 'justificatory science.' It was such academicians who created the situation where the party is unable to make use of the information supplied by historical science and has itself to make recommendations to the academics. Thus the CPSU Central Committee general secretary (I am thinking of the report delivered on the 70th anniversary of the October Revolution) and a duty fitter at the Kama Truck Plant TETS are forced to occupy themselves with history. Historians meanwhile write reviews of plays and express concern about the way young people are being raised. And young people in these articles appear only as the object of education, a stomach for digesting the food they are given, and it is very important that the food not be overcooked."

Did 25-year-old Valeriy Mokeyev, member of the CPSU, external student at Kazan University's History Department, and deputy secretary of the "Kamgesenergostroy" Komsomol Committee, have the right to make such a statement (in his paper "Bukharin and Young People: A View from the Eighties")? If you take a condescending view from Brezhnev City, the answer is "no," of course.

Today we have all to varying degrees taken up history. Even to have an emotional attitude to it is a sign of belonging either to those who are "opposed" to the (Stalinist, Brezhnevist) past or to those who would like to continue it. We are all taking part, as it were, in voting on a mass scale. But it is well known that it is easier even to go into a bayonet charge than to uphold your opinion on your own. The duty fitter whom Mokeyev, the club's political organizer, referred to, is Valeriy Pisigin (a 30-year-old member of the CPSU and an external student in the same department) and he started "voting" together with his friends when it was still recorded by name.

Detailed thought goes into devising the best way of getting the large trucks off the conveyor belt in Chelny. The life of young people seemed like a conveyor belt: From plant to meeting (or subbotnik) to hostel. They were able to "get off the production line" and unwind perhaps only in the dim lighting and loud music of the discotheque. And although it was there indeed that the "team" was chosen, it very quickly became obvious to Pisigin that pop music did not fill the spiritual vacuum. "We were sick of leading lousy lives" was, perhaps somewhat crudely, how one of the founders of the political club described its beginning. February 1983 was the date of its birth.

It is clear that "anti-Soviets" was the only description to be expected from anyone anywhere at the time, although they initially discussed only articles by T. Zaslavskaya, A. Aganbegyan, and G. Popov from the Novosibirsk journal EKO. However, the lack of requisite knowledge was soon felt—they began studying sources on the history of the party and the works of Lenin and Marx. In that way they came to Bukharin: first intuitively, and then, with greater confidence, seeing him as an alternative and opponent to Stalin and Stalinism.

They copied out articles by Bukharin by hand in the Kazan University library. Valeriy showed me his own hand-written history of the history of the CPSU—with portraits of party leaders and their biographies taken from encyclopedias and reprinted extracts from the proceedings of congresses and conferences. Their work was long and thorough—and for that reason it was not by chance or accident that club members wrote a letter to the CPSU Central Committee in April of last year requesting Bukharin's rehabilitation. And it is no great conceit on their part or exaggeration to say that they consider themselves engaged in cleansing Nikolay Bukharin's name from the filth of calumny and slander. On behalf of the March conference they again requested the CPSU leadership restore Bukharin to the party....

Eighteen months after its foundation, the club, which by that time was called Komsomolskaya Pravda [the Komsomol Truth] (not in honor of the newspaper of that name but because that truth should exist), was taken under the wing of the Komsomol Gorkom and leaders of the city's largest Komsomol organizations became activists in it, despite the fact that many city bosses initially did all they could to hinder it. Were these workers such wise politicians that they outwitted the conservatives and functionaries? I think they must have been. But perhaps the main thing is that they were not alone in being tired of showy, empty words....

"For many years they tried to hide from us the real meaning of Lenin's words, they altered and reshaped them, cut them up with 'scissors large and small,' and built 'self-serving structures' out of them. For many years very un-Leninist actions were carried out under cover of Lenin's name. The truly human traits of our friend and comrade, always ready when we are combating injustice and the going is tough to lend us assistance and say—*I wholeheartedly support your cause!*—was for decades hidden from us beneath a thick layer of stone and bronze and behind idyllic rose-colored portraits." (Extract from V. Pisigin's paper "V.I. Lenin's Last Letter")

However, they were not taken particularly seriously: An old candidate of sciences who paid a visit to a Komsomol Central Committee commission to find out what exactly was happening in the club condescendingly described its members as roosters: "They crow and crow but don't lay any eggs." They did not take offense but maintained that crowing also has its uses: People wake up. The present club members have no qualms about acknowledging that they have been "woken up." Farid Basharov, first secretary of the Komsomol gorkom and chairman of the club council, speaks:

"The decline in the Komsomol's prestige cannot be understood in isolation from the social situation as a whole. I also think it is connected with the fact that the right to take risks, the right to have one's own stance has been removed from young people. The club has helped me develop my stance. However," Farid Basharov added, "I am considered a 'moderate' there and am criticized very often...."

He is presumably also criticized outside the club, albeit for other reasons. It is easier to change the city's name than to get rid of the customary style of leadership. It would be easier for those accustomed to seeing the Komsomol merely as a device for conveying instructions as to where and how much labor enthusiasm to channel to fulfill (or, better, overfulfill) the plan to work with Farid or Ildus Nasyrov—secretary of the Kama Truck Plant Komsomol Committee—if the latter argued a bit less.

Ramil Salikhov, first secretary of the Avtozavodskiy Komsomol Raykom, presented Komsomol membership cards to schoolchildren in my presence:

"Faith alone is not enough today. You must read more, think for yourself, and weigh things out. All our hopes rest with you."

These did not seem to me the traditional parting words of advice to schoolchildren: They are more often urged to improve on their "fair" grades than to start combating bureaucracy in their own school.

Ramil, as far as I was able to see, conducted himself with that degree of independence and dignity that only comes from one thing—lack of fear of losing one's comfortable job as a functionary. And perhaps therein lies the essential "Komsomol truth"—not a fear of losing one's job but fear of discrediting oneself?

Meanwhile Ramil is worried on Pisigin's behalf. "Something is being hatched against Valeriy, he is really getting in the way of some people," he told me when he telephoned. There do not seem to be any grounds for concern except rumor, but I am beginning to think: What if someone is bent on stopping this free thinking, which is still unusual even today? Could he, incidentally, be sent somewhere further away than the chemical shop? But his behavior is bound to alarm the bureaucratic mind—yesterday he was telephoned by VOPROSY FILOSOFII on some matter while today he received a personal invitation from the FRG to attend a conference marking Bukharin's jubilee—what kind of fitter is that?

When N. Bukharin's name first arose at the club people began calling the members "Trotskyists" as the result of an involuntary association hammered into their heads since infancy. Nevertheless last December a letter was sent to Bukharin's widow, Anna Mikhaylovna Larina, asking for her "blessing" for the club's new name.

Is the name a concession to fashion, a new idol, a word that will rigidify into future dogmas? I think that Naberezhnyye Chelny is the last place where "neodogmatism"

threatens us. For them the restoration of historical justice—a cause in itself of high moral and educative value—is above all a means of solving today's difficulties and contradictions.

I was present when trade union committee Chairman Valeriy Starodubtsev (a 31-year-old CPSU member) called up the steel foundry director. If everyone defended working people's interests like him we would not have to witness trade union committees degenerating into a tool for defending the administration against workers.

"Recently we, as socialist competition winners, were awarded the Kama Truck Plant Challenge Banner, and I," Valeriy said, "rather than experiencing any joy merely felt uncomfortable. There have been eight fatal accidents at the plant since the beginning of the year, the ventilation at the foundry has not worked and still does not work, and the air pollution in some shops is almost 30 times above the norm. What is the point of the Kama Truck Plant if it does not benefit people? Strictly speaking, I should shut down the plant, but who would support me? And the plan! Why not include an environmental clean-up target in it alongside that for engine production? Should not people's interests come first and everything else second?"

Sergey Yershov, deputy chief engineer in charge of automatic lathe production (33 years old and a member of the CPSU) wrote the paper he gave on Bukharin's economic views and their links with the present day at night—he gets home late after work. After the conference the gossip at the plant was: "Yershov will end up in prison unless the bosses show him indulgence." Breaking the stereotype that goes "Such people should be put in prison, they argue too much" takes a good few years.

"Is it not too early to think about the next conference, this one has not yet been completely taken in nor all the material gathered?—I asked Aleksey Kalachev (he worked as an electrician, then did Komsomol and party work, and is now chairman of the board of an economically accountable youth association, he holds a diploma from Kazan University History Department and is 26 years old).

"We must not fall behind, the situation is changing very rapidly. We must take up the question of relations between society and the state—that is the most important thing now."

Pisigin: "We have often identified these concepts, and that is dangerous. It is necessary to properly investigate the idea of the state of all the people—and without Bukharin's books, this can't be done. I, incidentally, think that under Brezhnev the administer-and-command system nurtured by Stalin became more resourceful and flexible, and in that sense Stalinism became 'developed' and penetrated every fissure...."

Mokeyev: "The complexity of state-society relations also resides in the fact that the bureaucracy on top is powerfully buttressed and supported by conversativism below. And the situation is highly risky today—the ideas with which the press, for example, abounds are still far from having been accepted by everyone. And the raising of prices, say, can alter the situation unpredictably, since it has, to put it mildly, been inadequately studied at grassroots level."

Pisigin: "We are talking about public monitoring, but how can this be exercised without real power? Monitoring without power is surely self-deception? And power is ownership of the means of production. So we must again tackle the same questions: Giving the land to the peasants and the factories to the workers.... It is not fortuitous, after all, that the slogan "All Power to the Soviets!" has begun to be heard again."

Kalachev: "But we should not lapse into extremism when discussing ownership. Different interpenetrating forms of ownership—state, cooperative, collective, and individual—must exist. And this must depend not on any kind of current or the desires of functionaries but exclusively on social needs."

However rapidly the situation changes, I think that they will have something to discuss, something to rack their brains over.

So what is the political club like? It is primarily a form of collective self-education. Everyone must participate in discussions, is obliged to formulate his own standpoint, and must know how to read and write seriously. Together they study what was not taught at school, what people have tried to discourage them from doing during their adult lives, they learn how to think. In their joint search for the truth everyone is equal—the political club is a school for democracy.

Around 1,000 people have gone through the club in the 5 years it has been in operation: Apart from the hard core of "full members" there is a large shifting body of people that changes from session to session. The meetings have value, I think, even for chance visitors: You can talk as much as you like about the need to respect the opinion of others, but it is better to see it in practice just once.

Having learned about dialogue and how to conduct relaxed discussion and relations, the young men are transferring the working methods they have mastered into their teams, offices, and lecture halls. This is the point of the club's work, but not its sole one. An active life stance is not something you can just invoke, no matter how often you do it. Involvement in the revolutionary past is a natural condition for participation in the present. The young men have taken on the difficult job of drawing together the all but broken threads stretching from generation to generation, from the past to us and from us to the future.

The club has a large correspondence with academics and the editors of newspapers and journals. Judging by the letters and responses that I heard from both sides, the need is reciprocal, the broken link between the generations has drawn both young and old.

There is no point in trying to work out who needed whom more—whether it was the young people from Naberezhnyye Chelny seeking to find their place in history and the present who needed Anna Mikhaylovna Larina more or she, exhausted by half a century of waiting for the right to defend her husband, them. For her and for them the first letter and the first meeting were overwhelming and became the start of a friendship.

...Before going on the night shift Valeriy Pisigin received in his cramped home study, piled high with manuscripts and books, Vyacheslav Isayev, a petroleum engineer from Almetyevsk, who had come to learn about setting up a political club. He was given articles and books by Valeriy: "Start with these. Study and discuss...."

Judging by the expression in the eyes of the courier from Almatyevsk, he would have liked to take away everything that he saw around him. What sort of meager official ration of quotations did people have to be kept on to develop such a craving for real knowledge!

And now you hear professional social scientists expressing their misgivings—suppose these ill-informed young people are misled. Perhaps some will be—there is no guarantee, no care has been taken. It is only possible to prevent people getting carried away by pseudorevolutionary phrases and a genuine desire to make one's mark on social life from being reduced to labels and slogans by moving forward and building up knowledge. I think that this condition has been accepted in the Bukharin Club.

I do not think it any accident that the club arose in a city built equally on sincere enthusiasm and ineradicable sham, whose interweaving has produced the intolerable acuteness of social contradictions there. This was bound to make people think. And you can no longer deceive people once they have begun to think. Even less forbid thinking. And perhaps it is precisely in this sense that Neberezhnye Chelny will have to play its once-alloted role of "city of the future."

Postscript: When the article was ready for the press, a call was received from Naberezhnyye Chelny: N. Galiullin, secretary of the Kama Truck Plant party committee, who was nominated by the 130,000-strong collective as a delegate to the 19th party conference, had not been elected.

Were they really in a hurry to change the city's name?

Cinema Union Officials on State of Art

LD1606183788 Moscow World Service in English 0310 GMT 16 Jun 88

[Excerpts] The 19th Communist Party conference is due to be held in Moscow at the end of this month. It will become an event of (?major) importance for this country. Elem Klimov, the head of the Cinema Workers' Union has been elected a delegate to the conference. At a news conference held in the House of Cinema Workers in Moscow recently, leaders of the union told journalists what the state of affairs is like in the movie industry today. [passage omitted]

[Begin Plakhov recording in Russian with superimposed English translation] Today we're detailing with a new type of conflict. They haven't disappeared altogether but have been modified. Twenty or thirty years ago the fate of many films was decided behind closed doors by bureaucrats and dilettantes. Then these works used to settle down in archives or safes. Today it's the showing of films, documentaries in particular, that gives us much trouble. Brilliant documentaries are released in just a few copies and as a result cinema goers have no opportunity to see really talented work. Besides, conflicts often break out between film studios and administrative bodies. For example a group of film makers shot a documentary called Pain in Belorussia. It told about the consequences of the war in Afghanistan. The studio managers, however, decided that no one needed that work. Yet after the interference of our commission [of experts] and of the Cinema Workers' Union the work on the documentary was completed. There's one more problem that film makers are concerned about today. Cases are not rare when cuts are made in the films without their authors' consent. It's the duty of our commission to deal with such conflicts. So members of the commission have plenty of work. Our main purpose is to provide the most favorable conditions for creative work. We are not guaranteed from further conflict. Our commission protects not only film workers, but cinema audiences as well. We have no intention to deprive them of the opportunity to see good films. [end recording] [passage omitted]

(Igor Lisakovskiy), a secretary of the board of the Cinema Workers' Union said: The 2 years [that] have passed since our congress have shown that our work is now much easier. Not a single decision concerning movies can be taken without the knowledge of our union. Many bureaucratic instructions have been cancelled. The situation regarding censorship has been changed drastically. Now the censors perform their purely censorial functions, without interfering with the creative side of our work.

However, we are concerned about film studios belonging to the ethnic republics. Our union will devote its next fullscale meeting to the efforts to create the most favorable conditions for the work of our colleagues in ethnic republics. In general our work is now marked by the highest degree of openness. [passage omitted]

Economic

PRAVDA Account of Decision on Combine Work

PM1606082188 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 10 Jun 88 Second Edition p 2

[Unattributed report: "At the CPSU Central Committee"]

[Text] The CPSU Central Committee has adopted a resolution "On the Work of the Kuznetsk Metallurgical Combine's Party Committee and Economic Leaders To Boost the Labor Activeness of Workers and Specialists During the Transition to Complete Economic Accountability."

The resolution notes that the Kuznetsk Metallurgical Combine's party committee (Secretary Comrade A.V. Reutov) and economic leaders (General Director Comrade A.F. Kuznetsov), guided by the decisions of the CPSU Central Committee on restructuring in all spheres of our society and the transition to a new economic mechanism, are carrying out considerable work to develop the creative initiative and independence of workers, specialists, and the entire labor collective as the main link in the process of broadening and deepening the democratization of production management and implementing social and economic transformations. To this end a system for cadre education and for involving working people in the elaboration and implementation of measures on production and social issues in light of economic accountability has been elaborated at the combine and supported by the collective. The main avenue is to seek out and bring into play internal reserves, with the emphasis primarily on the combine's own efforts. The USSR Law on the State Enterprise (Association) is being implemented consistently. The election of labor collective councils has been completed.

The party committee and shop party organizations and party groups, which have become the political nucleus of the restructuring under way at the combine, have boosted Communists' vanguard role in the new conditions of economic activity. This is considerably facilitated by the widespread practice of discussing party members' reports on their fulfillment of the demands of the CPSU Rules and by individual conversations about the extent of their participation in the processes of restructuring.

The combine's party committee and economic leaders are persistently mastering the new style of leadership under conditions of developing democracy and are creating a favorable atmosphere for each working person to contribute creatively to the improvement of production. Virtually the entire collective has joined in restructuring and in improving work quality. Creative initiative groups of highly skilled workers and specialists have been assigned a special place in assimilating the new economic mechanism in order to elaborate and organize the implementation of specific measures to resolve key tasks—boost labor productivity, quality, and profitability, improve contract deliveries of metallurgical output, and resolve social questions.

The initiative by a number of workshops to the effect that the technical renewal of production during capital repair should be carried out largely through the efforts of the collective gained support and is now widespread at the combine. This has made it possible to increase the manufacture of finished rolled metal. The level of the best indicators—compared with world indicators—of railroad rail quality has been achieved.

A great deal is being done to create a stable collective. Work on vocational guidance and the mentor system is being carried out purposefully. Approximately 3,000 young workers have been assigned to frontrunners and labor veterans. Constant concern is shown for improving production and living conditions. New consumer service facilities and health and recuperation centers have been constructed, the existing ones have been reequipped, and the sale of foodstuffs and industrial goods and provision of consumer services have organized with the direct particpation of shop workers and specialists. The production of agricultural output at the subsidiary farm rose 50 percent in the last 5 years and in 1987 totaled 10 kg of meat, 77 kg of milk, 171 kg of potatoes, and 95 kg of vegetables per working person.

All this has made it possible to ensure highly productive and smooth work and made the combine a front-ranking enterprise in the sector. Plans are being overfulfilled in terms of the production of output and economic indicators, and 100-percent delivery of finished rolled metal according to contract and a stable financial situation are ensured. The collective successfully fulfilled the socialist pledges to greet the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference in a fitting manner.

At the same time the resolution notes that the Kuznetsk Metallurgical Combine's party committee and leadership are still not making full use of the possibilities opened up by the new conditions of economic activity in order to further step up organizational and political education work to boost the labor activeness of workers and specialists. The line of deepening internal production economic accountability, developing it in sectors and teams, and introducing personal savings records is being implemented insufficiently consistently and persistently. A number of questions of material and moral incentives for working people have not been fully studied and the organization of universal economic basic education needs to be improved and the level of professional knowledge of engineering and leading personnel needs to be increased.

The CPSU Central Committee instructed the combine's party committee and economic leaders to improve organizational and educational work at the new phase of restructuring and gear it more toward developing collective members' labor, social, and political activeness,

glasnost, and democracy, satisfying working people's demands and interests as far as possible, and fostering self-management skills in them.

It was stressed that the comprehensive expansion of democratic forms and work methods and the strict fulfillment of the USSR Law on the State Enterprise (Association) are the basis determining the successful implementation of the radical economic reform and the guarantee of accelerated social development and the fulfillment of plan targets and socialist pledges. Party, economic, trade union, and Komsomol organizations must daily pay close attention to these questions.

The combine's economic leaders and party organizations must, guided by the decisions of the CPSU Central Committee January (1987) and February (1988) Plenums, further improve work with cadres, impart more glasnost to it, and improve the principles of the election and accountability of leaders. They must considerably reinforce cadres' economic studies and ensure that this work is systematic and continuous so that workers can skillfully apply the knowledge they have acquired in their practical activity and react in a timely fashion to the prevailing economic situation. They must constantly probe matters at vocational schools and help them to train skilled metallurgists. They must enhance the role of the labor collective council in resolving important questions of production activity and the combine's economic and social development.

Attention was drawn to the need to step up work to create appropriate production and consumer service conditions for collective members, to rapidly step up housing construction using the own-resources method, and to meet more fully working people's need for children's preschool establishments and medical services. They must further develop subsidiary farms and fulfill plans for rendering paid services to the population.

The CPSU Central Committee considers one of the most important tasks for the combine's party organization and economic leaders to be the acceleration of work to improve the ecological situation, ensure the unconditional fulfillment of all nature protection measures and the strict observance of production units' operating procedures, and to introduce ecologically clean technological processes during reconstruction.

The CPSU Central Committee drew the attention of the leaders of the USSR Gosplan, the USSR Ministry of Ferrous Metallurgy, and the USSR Ministry of Construction in the Urals and West Siberia Regions of the USSR to the indiscipline permitted to occur in the implementation of the targets envisaged by CPSU Central Committee and USSR Council of Ministers resolutions for the reconstruction of the Kuznetsk Metallurgical Combine and demanded that the requisite conclusions be drawn from this and that additional measures ensuring their fulfillment be adopted.

Slyunkov at Estonian Cost Accounting Meeting

LD1006150588 Moscow TASS in English 0415 GMT 10 Jun 88

[Text] Tallinn June 10—ETA correspondent Waldemar Hiuva writes:

There is hardly another economic problem that would be so passionately and in such great detail discussed by Estonia's public on the eve of the 19th party conference as the idea of republican cost-accounting in Estonia.

In keeping with the decision of the Bureau of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Estonia a commission has been set up to elaborate and economically substantiate a regional cost-accounting system. It will have, in particular, also to examine questions pertaining to equivalent exchanges between various regions and union republics, creating a reliable economic machinery for the protection of natural resources and normalising the demographic situation in the republic, etc.

"The idea of republican cost-accounting presupposes an enhancement of the republic's economic and political sovereignty on the basis of Lenin's principles of equality of all nations and preserving centralism within the framework of the USSR for the resolution of the most important tasks in the common interests, Estonian Academician Mikhail Bronstein believes." [quotation marks received]

"Estonia is known in this country as a bold experimenter in restructuring the economic machinery and search for new forms of management," Nikolay Slyunkov, member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, noted at the meeting on May 27 with party activists of the republic. He analyzed in his speech the course of restructuring in Soviet Estonia in connection with the positive changes taking place in this country.

Nikolay Slyunkov noted that the most urgent problem today is a radical reform of economic management and all-round democratisation of the society. Resolute measures have been taken in Estonia for a restructuring of the organizational structure of management. It is precisely from Estonia that the proposals came that unnecessary ministries and sectors of the administration be closed and effective structures be created for the management of whole economic complexes. The point at issue is the establishment of committees for industry, transport and public services.

The republic has now vigorously taken up the work to streamline the system of wholesale trade in the means of production. Now Estonia's example has been followed, for example by Belorussia, Moldavia and Armenia. Such forms of wholesale trade are to be introduced on a larger scale in other republics.

Characterising the course of the economic reform, the secretary of the CPSU Central Committee said that all the potentialities of cost-accounting are far from being fully used. Therefore, of such a great significance is the experience accumulated by the Estonian Ministry of the Light Industry, which started already way back in 1984 a restructuring of the administration in industry and introduction of full cost-accounting.

Touching upon the idea of territorial cost-accounting which is broadly discussed in the republic, Nikolay Slyunkov noted that the USSR State Planning Committee (Gosplan) and the Finance Ministry had carried out a preliminary study of the problem and have drawn the conclusion that the relations between the union budget and the budget of the republic should be built on a long-term standard basis. The decision has also been approved on withdrawing a number of big industrial projects in Estonia's territory from the administration of the union ministries. These measures are aimed at lessening the departmental administration and broadening the possibilities of the regions in the administration of the economy.

In the opinion of Academician Mikhail Bronstein, transition of republican cost-accounting will necessitate a strict observance of the law of the USSR on socialist enterprise (amalgamation) guaranteeing greater economic independence and responsibility of these main sections of production. The latter, naturally not confine themselves to the republican framework but look for and find acceptable partners all over the country while simultaneously fulfilling the state orders of the union bodies. Since the ultimate goals of the republican cost accounting is a sharp intensification of production on the basis of the modern methods of production an improvement in the living standards of the population and ensuring an increase of the republic's contribution to the whole country's economic progress.

Light Industry Workers Day Observed

LD1206093088 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0600 GMT 12 Jun 88

[Excerpt] The day of the light industry workers is being marked today. This year the sector is operating considerably better than last year. It has proved possible to carry out most of the assignments for production of vital articles. In 1987, the number of enterprises failing to meet their contractual delivery obligations fell by half in comparison with the previous year. There was a reduction in the number of claims for replacement. This made additional funds available for technical reequipping for production, resolution of social problems, and the improvement of working conditions. But the potentials of light industry are far from being exhausted. [passage omitted]

Agricultural

Nikonov Visit to Chelyabinsk Aktiv Reported

Addresses Members

LD1506123888 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1000 GMT 15 Jun 88

[Text] A principled and earnest discussion was held today at a meeting of the Chelyabinsk party and economic aktiv. Those taking part discussed the tasks of party, local soviet, and economic bodies in improving the supply of foodstuffs to the population of the oblast. Comrade Nikonov, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, spoke at the meeting of the aktiv.

Tours Pedigree Farm

LD1506222188 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1430 GMT 15 Jun 88

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] As has already been reported, Viktor Petrovich Nikonov is in Chelyabinsk Oblast. Our special correspondents have this report:

[Begin V.Sergeyev and I.Bolotnikov videorecording] The Rossiya state pedigree farm. The young stock of this farm, which each year sells 350 heifer calves and 150 bull calves, is a good foundation for increasing milk production at many kolkhozes and sovkhozes in the southern Urals. Purposeful breeding has made it possible to create a highly-productive herd. In the summer camp Viktor Petrovich was shown the very latest all-union champion, the cow Rossiyanka. In 1 year it has produced over 18 tonnes of milk. Of course such cows are rare. But the collective of the state pedigree farm must conduct breeding and pedigree work in such a way as to appreciably influence results at other farms of the region, the CPSU Central Committee secretary said. The state pedigree farm must become an advanced experience school for livestock workers throughout the southern Urals.

They continued the conversation about ways of raising the productivity of all branches of animal husbandry at the oblast exhibition of pedigree animals and poultry. Here Comrade Nikonov acquainted himself with the best breeds of livestock and poultry and advised the farm specialists and managers to set up more energetically scientific production associations, where by combining science with practice, ways to satisfy the population's growing needs for food can be found more quickly.

Talking to Sosnovskiy and Krasnoarmeyskiy Rayons Sovkhoz workers, specialists, and managers, Viktor Petrovich Nikonov drew attention to the poor utilization of such reserves as collective, family, and other kinds of lease contracting. In introducing new forms of organizing and remunerating work there is a lot of formalism

and oversimplification. A person working on the land must be made into someone who is truly in charge of it. Only this can raise the efficiency of agricultural production in a very brief period.

The tasks of party, local soviet, and economic bodies in improving the provision of food to the oblast's population were discussed today at a meeting of the Chelyabinsk obkom aktiv.

Viktor Petrovich Nikonov, who spoke at the meeting, stressed that the food program and improving the population's supply with foodstuffs is a very important task of the restructuring taking place in the country. Their tasks must be regarded as an urgent and priority matter, and in doing so maximum use must be made of the immense reserves which exist in the southern Urals. [video shows Nikonov visiting Rossiya state pedigree farm, at an oblast exhibition of pedigree animals and poultry, addressing open air meeting of farmers, and the obkom aktiv meeting in a hall] [end recording]

Completes Tour

LD1606111388 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0800 GMT 16 Jun 88

[Text] Comrade Nikonov, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, stayed in Kurgan and Chelyabinsk oblasts between 9 and 15 June. He visited industrial enterprises, science and research institutues, kolkhozes and sovkhozes, and had conversations with urban and countryside toilers. In Magnitogorsk Gorkom, during a meeting with the town's party and soviet aktiv and the aktiv of the adjacent rural rayons, a proposal was voiced to build a big combine with a multi-industry profile. The importance of sharply increasing the production of meat and other produce in subsidiary farms was stressed.

Leaders Sign Obituary of Agricultural Scientist

PM1606130588 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 8 Jun 88 Morning Edition p 6

[Obituary of Fedor Grigoryevich Kirichenko]

[Excerpts] The USSR Gosagroprom and the Presidium of the V.I. Lenin All-Union Academy of Agricultural Sciences announce with deep regret that Fedor Grigoryevich Kirichenko, prominent Soviet selection specialist and scientist, Hero of Socialist Labor, USSR Lenin and State prizewinner, active member of the V.I. Lenin All-Union Academy of Agricultural Sciences, and member of the CPSU since 1929, has died after a serious and prolonged illness.

F.G. Kirichenko was born in a peasant family 2 March, 1904, in the village of Vladislavka in Kiev Oblast. [passage omitted]

Ye.K. Ligachev, V.P. Nikonov, V.V. Shcherbitskiy, V.S. Murakhovskiy, G.I. Marchuk, B.L. Tolstykh, I.I. Skiba, V.A. Masol, I.A. Mozgovoy, Yu.A. Kolomiyets, A.A. Nikonov, G.A. Romanenko, M.B. Ryzhikov, N.Z. Milashchenko, I.S. Shatilov, V.S. Shevelukha, A.A. Sozinov, L.K. Sechnyak, D.A. Dolgushin, I.G. Kalinenko, A.V. Pukhalskiy, Yu.M. Puchkov, Ye.T. Varenitsa, S.V. Biryukov.

Scientific

Marchuk Advocates Science Academy Elections

LD1606220488 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 16 Jun 88

[Text] [Presenter] I wish to begin with the subject with which all Soviet people are concerned. I have in mind the forthcoming 19th all-union party conference. Today's meeting of the USSR Academy of Sciences Presidium was not quite as usual. It was held this time in the Zelinskiy Institute of Organic Chemistry. Its participants discussed the theses of the CPSU Central Committee for the coming party conference. Many questions, wishes, and requests were addressed to Guriy Ivanovich Marchuk, president of the USSR Academy of Sciences, who is a delegate to the conference. He acquainted the scientists with his own stand. And now here is our correspondent's recording:

[Begin Marchuk recording] A struggle of views, opinions, and approaches is necessary in science more than in any other sphere. A contest or competition between scientific schools is able to create a powerful inner impetus for the development of science. This must be ensured in competitive scientific programs on the one hand, and on the other hand all those occupying scientific and administrative posts, from head of a laboratory up to the president, must be replaced through competitive elections, I repeat, through competitive elections. This is precisely the path that we intend to follow.

The theses, as you know, propose now that officials can be elected for and should be replaced after two terms. It is supposed that all officials in state establishments may be elected for a third term only providing their collectives want this. The person can be elected provided three-quarters vote for him in a secret ballot. But what about the Academy of Sciences? Since we are heading for broad democratization, I propose that a period of no more than two 5-year terms of uninterrupted service is established for all of those, without exception, who occupy academic posts, from head of a laboratory up to the president.

The problem of cadres should be discussed separately. The theses of the Central Committee are literally permeated by its concern for this problem. There must not be any other criteria in science but the creative abilities of a scientist and his loyalty to the cause of developing our society. This is the road that the Academy will take. However, I can say with complete certainty that the

genuine development of science is impossible unless it is independent to quite a high degree in the system of public links and relations. It must be free from petty supervision and bureaucratic control exercised by the administrative apparatus, and must have every opportunity to speak of its own positions on all issues concerning both its own processes and all of the country's socioeconomic and political processes.

Even in the hard times of the cult of personality and stagnation, many leaders of the Academy of Sciences, scientists—the most prominent scientists—found strength and courage to oppose administrative pressure and arbitrariness. These traditions must receive broad development in the conditions of restructuring and democratization. We also must actively conquer positions in world science. [end recording]

Sagdeyev, Primakov on French Space Cooperation

LD1606122188 Moscow TASS in English 1019 GMT 16 Jun 88

[Text] Moscow June 16 TASS—By TASS science writer Nikolay Zheleznov:

French specialists are prepared to discuss the possibility of France taking part in preparations for an international manned mission to Mars. France's leading laboratories also expressed readiness to cooperate with scientific centres of the Soviet Academy of Sciences in 60 priority areas, including projects in the field of high-temperature superconductivity, electronic and computer technology, nature conservation, bio-technology and research instrument making. These are but a few results of a visit to France by a delegation of Soviet scientists, led by the president of the USSR Academy of Sciences. The visit has just ended.

Asked about the reason behind the recent upsurge in contacts between the two countries, Academician Roald Sagdeyev, director of the Space Research Institute, said that in the sphere of his scientific interests no special breakthroughs were made in the course of a dialogue between Soviet and French scientists. Contacts with French scientists have long been raised to a status of permanent real projects. The French take a great interest in space and look forward to Jean-Loup Chretien's flight in December on a month-long Soviet-French expedition to the orbital station Mir. "Therefore I was not surprised by the wish of my French colleagues to discuss with us and Americans their participation in the Mars expedition," Sagdeyev stressed.

"Personally, I am surprised by neither this news nor the interests of the French in space," said another member of the delegation, Academician Yevgeniy Primakov, who is director of the Institute of the World Economy and International Affairs. "This means that our French colleagues have a good instinct for new developments in world science and technology. But other thing was surprising: There was a marked increase in the interest of French scientists to our social sciences, probably, due to the process of democratisation in all fields of life of Soviet society."

Yevgeniy Primakov said his other impression from the visit to France was that the dominance of politics in contacts between scientists, engineers and art personalities of various countries was becoming a thing of the past. Direct ties between separate scientists, laboratories and specialists are considerably far ahead of intergovernmental agreements and acts. In this connection, the academician said, the gesture of the French president, who bestowed on President of the USSR Academy of Sciences Guriy Marchuk the Legion of Honour on June 7, can be seen as clear encouragement to direct contacts between scientists of the two countries, an impetus to further building bridges of trust between the Soviet and French academies.

Cosmonauts Undock From 'Mir', Return to Earth

'Zora' Microprocessor Cited

LD1606103388 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 15 Jun 88

[From the "Vremya" newscast; K. Grudkin video report]

[Text] The flight of the international crew aboard the Mir orbiting complex is continuing. Here is a report:

[K.Grudkin] We have already become accustomed to the phrase: the cosmonauts are feeling fine. This can be seen especially well from Viktor Savinykh's gymnastic tricks. Of course, the scientists have already accumulated some experience in training. Nevertheless, until now the machanisms of developing the disturbed functioning of the organism in weightlessness remain undiscovered. That is why the medico-biological research included in the program of the Soviet-Bulgarian crew is very intensive.

The "Zora" microprocessor system—this is a new Bulgarian invention—simplifies the cosmonauts' work considerably. Data on virtually all experiments can be fed into it. The system will ensure not only the issuing of instructions but also an analysis of the materials obtained. The data registered on disks will return to earth and will perhaps provide answers to some questions.

While the reportage from orbit was in progress Vladimir Titov was exercising on the running track. And here is the view of this space veteran.

[Titov, smiling, speaking into microphone] The best medical training is physical training. [video shows Viktor Savinykh doing somersaults in Mir; Aleksandrov using the "Zora" microprocessor system; Vladimir Titov running on the running track]

'Soyuz' Prepares for Return

LD1606111788 Moscow TASS in English 0951 GMT 16 Jun 88

[Text] Moscow June 16 TASS—The cosmonauts of the main crew comprising Vladimir Titov and Musa Manarov and the visiting expedition—Anatoliy Solovev, Viktor Savinykh (all of the USSR) and Aleksandur Aleksandrov (Bulgaria)—are winding up their programme of joint work on board the orbital complex Mir (peace).

Today, they will carry out a number of medico-biological experiments and conduct two series of remote probing of Bulgaria's territory during the station's flight above that country.

A concluding experiment on space materialogy has been conducted using the Kristallizator unit. Its aim was to study the possibility of obtaining in micro-gravity conditions samples of composite material, tungsten-aluminium, with improved properties.

Protein mono-crystals were grown under the Biokristallizator experiment.

Preparations have been started for the return of the Soyuz TM-4 spacecraft with the cosmonauts Solovev, Savinykh and Aleksandrov.

The crew are transferring documentation, video and audio tapes and films and biological object sets into the landing module. They will bring to earth materials of studies conducted under the Soviet-Bulgarian space project and during the work of Titov and Manarov.

According to crew reports and telemetry information, the flight is proceeding in keeping with schedule. All the cosmonauts are well and feeling fine.

Biotechnological Studies Noted

LD1606155288 Moscow TASS in English 1449 GMT 16 Jun 88

[Text] Moscow June 16 TASS—The three-man Soviet-Bulgarian space crew currently on board the orbiting platform Mir today began preparing to return to earth Friday.

Mir's long-time occupants Vladimir Titov and Musa Manarov will stay on after the visiting team of Mission Commander Anatoliy Solovev, Flight Engineer Viktor Savinykh and Bulgarian researcher cosmonaut Aleksandur Aleksandrov departs for home.

Since the five began working together June 9 they have carried out a wide-ranging package of nature studies, technological experiments, medico-biological tests and astrophysics observations.

Most of these studies have been designed in the interest of the Bulgarian economy.

One research program concerned with geological resources, for example, has involved remote sensing of Bulgaria's territory. The cosmonauts will conduct two more imagery sessions today when flying over that country.

A number of studies have been performed under Soviet research programs. They have included biotechnological experiments in the Ainur unit to produce protein monocrystals in zero gravity for research purposes and in the Ruchei (streamlet) electrophoresis installation to clean genetically engineered Interferon. Such cleaning is difficult to do on earth.

'Soyuz' Undocking Reported

LD1706100888 Moscow TASS in English 1004 GMT 17 Jun 88

[Text] Moscow June 17 TASS—By TASS correspondent Rena Kuznetsova: Vladimir Titov and Musa Manarov sent off the Soviet-Bulgarian international crew of Anatoliy Solovev, Viktor Savinykh and Bulgarian research cosmonaut Aleksandur Aleksandrov on board the Mir orbital complex today.

At 8 a.m. today the air-lock was closed. At 10 hours 18 minutes Moscow time, the Soyuz TM-4 spacecraft and the orbital complex undocked. Then the spacecraft flew round the Mir orbital station. The cosmonauts took pictures of the station.

The Mission Control Centre reported that at 13 hours 22 minutes deceleration propulsion units of the spacecraft will be switched on, and at 14 hours 13 minutes the soft landing will take place. The earth is waiting for its envoys—the Soviet-Bulgarian space crew.

Cosmonauts and specialists are unanimous that no other flight within the Interkosmos framework was so packed with research experiments. Some 40 nature study, technological, medical, biological and astrophysical experiments were held.

Vladimir Titov and Musa Manarov, in space for nearly six months now, will continue their mission.

Landing Reported

LD1706103588 Moscow TASS in English 1030 GMT 17 Jun 88

[Text] Moscow June 17 TASS—The descent module carrying the international crew of Soviet cosmonauts Anatoliy Solovev and Viktor Savinykh and Bulgarian research Cosmonaut Aleksandur Aleksandrov has made a soft landing.

Mission Summarized

LD1706111688 Moscow TASS in English 1110 GMT 17 Jun 88

[Text] Moscow June 17 TASS—An international crew of Soviet cosmonauts Anatoliy Solovyev and Viktor Savinykh and Bulgarian space researcher Aleksandur Aleksandrov returned to earth at 14 hours 13 minutes Moscow time today after completing planned work on board the orbiting research platform Mir.

Mir's resident team of Vladimir Titov and Musa Manarov have stayed on to continuing their long-duration mission.

The descent capsule of the Soyuz TM-4 spaceship touched down 202 kilometres south east of the city of Dzhezkazgan.

The three spacemen were feeling well after landing.

During their eight-day stay on Mir they have carried out all the planned studies and experiments jointly designed by Soviet and Bulgarian scientists. A large share of that work has been done using Bulgarian-developed equipment.

The international crew have fulfilled a wide-ranging program of geophysics studies, including photography and spectrometry sessions focusing on the territory of Bulgaria, the Black Sea and other regions. The obtained information will be used in tackling scientific and economic tasks.

During their flight the cosmonauts have also tried out a general-purpose astrophysics system and performed several series of experiments to study galactic and exogalactic irradiation sources, the interplanetary medium and physical processes under way in the ionosphere and atmosphere of earth.

Experiments conducted in keeping with a program for space materials studies have produced samples of monocrystals of metallic alloyws and composite materials with improved characteristics.

A significant place in the activities of the international crew has been occupied by medical experiments contributing to a comprehensive study of humans' ability to work during adjustment to zero gravity.

Titov, Manarov, Solovyev, Savinykh and Aleksandrov have worked efficiently, demonstrating high professional standards, at every phase of the joint flight.

The successfully completed Soviet-Bulgarian mission is an example of fruitful international cooperation in the peaceful uses of outer space.